Daily Report

Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-93-111
Friday
11 June 1993

Daily Report
Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-93-111 *11 June 1993*

CONTENTS

INTERREGIONAL AFFAIRS

Council of Defense Ministers To Meet 15 Jun *[ITAR-TASS]* 1
Latvian Observers View 'Baltic Operation 93' Exercises *[LETA]* 1
Slav Republic Border Oblasts To Set Up Unified Ruble Zone *[PRAVDA 10 Jun]* 1
ITAR-TASS Carries Press Review for 11 Jun 1

RUSSIA INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Yeltsin Requests Chernomyrdin Postpone U.S. Visit *[ITAR-TASS]* 3
Foreign Minister Kozyrev Leaves for Athens *[ITAR TASS]* 3
Arrives for North Atlantic Council Meeting *[ITAR-TASS]* 3
Soyuz-4 Fishing Boat Taken to PRC Naval Base *[Moscow International]* 3
Chinese Attitude 'Worsened' *[ITAR-TASS]* 3
Negotiator on Talks With PRC on Disputed Islands *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Jun]* 4
South Kuril Islands Face Energy Shortages *[ITAR-TASS]* 4
Russian Businessman Refused Entry to Hokkaido *[ITAR-TASS]* 4
Yastrzhembskiy Clarifies Stance on 'Safe Areas' *[IZVESTIYA 11 Jun]* 5
Ukrainian 'Hawks' Berated for Black Sea Fleet Stance *[PRAVDA 9 Jun]* 5
Khasbulatov Address Urges Settlement *[ITAR-TASS]* 5
Kasatonov, Ukrainian Officials on Issue *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 11 Jun]* 6
Emergency Committee Team Flies to Sukhumi *[Moscow Radio]* 7
Air Force Wives Stage Runway Protest at Base in Belarus *[PRAVDA 9 Jun]* 7
Kozyrev Welcomes 'Increasingly Mature' Ties With Kyrgyzstan *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 9 Jun]* 7
Results of Russian-Estonian Talks in Moscow Analyzed 7
News Conference on Talks *[IZVESTIYA 10 Jun]* 7
Border Questions Said 'Complex' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Jun]* 8
Estonia Optimistic About Troop Withdrawal *[Tallinn Radio]* 8
Fedorov Leads Delegation at Bulgarian Trade Talks *[Moscow TV]* 9
Government Calls For Concrete Results at Mideast Talks *[ITAR-TASS]* 9
Government Sets Rules for Financial Ties With India *[ITAR-TASS]* 9
German Minesweepers Visit St. Petersburg *[ITAR-TASS]* 10
Norway To Carry Out Military Inspection of 6th Army *[ITAR-TASS]* 10
Government Officially Applies for GATT Membership *[ITAR-TASS]* 10
Prospects for Signing Accord With EC Analyzed *[SEGODNYA 11 Jun]* 11
Work on Treaty With EC Stepped Up for Yeltsin Visit *[IZVESTIYA 9 Jun]* 11
Implications of East Europe-NATO Ties Eyed *[IZVESTIYA 8 Jun]* 12
Russia 'Well Represented' at Paris Air Show *[Moscow International]* 12
Exhibit Showcases Non-Military Aircraft *[ITAR-TASS]* 12

RUSSIA NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Constitutional Conference

Plenary Session Meets 10 Jun Under Yeltsin *[Moscow Radio]* 14
Yeltsin Addresses Session *[Russian TV]* 14
Shumeyko Addresses Session *[Russian TV]* 15
Calls For Equality of Citizens *[ITAR-TASS]* 16
Chernomyrdin Addresses Session *[Russian TV]* 16
Further Chernomyrdin Comment *[ITAR-TASS]* 16
Shakhray Addresses Session *[Russian TV]* 17
Ryabov Addresses Session *[Russian TV]* 17
Sobchak Addresses Session *[Russian TV]* 17

Moscow Mayor Addresses Session *[Russian TV]* 18
Yakovlev Addresses Session *[Russian TV]* 18
Rumyantsev Addresses Session *[Russian TV]* 19
Official Remarks Summarized *[ITAR-TASS]* 19
Yeltsin Interviewed After Session *[Radio Rossii]* 20
Rumyantsev Interviewed on Drafts *[Radio Rossii]* 20
Further on 9 Jun Conference Proceedings 20
Shumeyko: 80% Want Single Draft *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 9 Jun]* 20
Groups' Work Reported *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 10 Jun]* 20
Further on 8 Jun Conference Proceedings 21
Shakhray Addresses Group *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 10 Jun]* 21
Working Groups' Progress Reported *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 10 Jun]* 22
More on Groups' Progress *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 9 Jun]* 23
Yeltsin Victories Are 'Defeats for Russia' *[PRAVDA 9 Jun]* 25
More Concessions to Republics Seen Likely *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 9 Jun]* 26
Faction Coordinators Assail Conference, Events *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 10 Jun]* 28
Conference's Impact on Supreme Soviet Viewed *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 9 Jun]* 29

Political Issues

Yeltsin Addresses Nation on Independence Day *[Moscow Radio]* 29
Khasbulatov Suffering From High Blood Pressure *[ITAR-TASS]* 31
Shaposhnikov Agrees To Head Security Council *[ITAR-TASS]* 31
Council of Ministers Presidium Meets 10 Jun 31
Discusses Budget, Forms Commission *[Russian TV]* 31
Machine-Building Program Approved *[ITAR-TASS]* 31
Further on Presidium Meeting *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 11 Jun]* 32
Zorkin Discusses Court's Role, Conference *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 10 Jun]* 32
Court Seeks Protection of Presidential Guard *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 9 Jun]* 35
Alleged Excerpts From Yeltsin Team Meeting *[PRAVDA 10 Jun]* 36

Military Issues

Officers' Gathering Continues in Moscow 37
Grachev Wants More Contract Recruitment *[Moscow Tv]* 37
Yeltsin Speech Published *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Jun]* 37
Yeltsin Speaks at Promotion Ceremony for Senior Officers *[ITAR-TASS]* 40

Media & Economic Issues

Minister on Media Control Legislation *[Moscow TV]* 41
Both Sides 'Satisfied' With Freedom of Speech Verdict *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 29 May]* 43
Justice Ministry Loses Lawsuit Against DEN *[ITAR-TASS]* 43
'RTV-Press' Evicted by Yeltsin 'Protege' Bragin *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 10 Jun]* 44
Roundtable Mulls Economic Accord Declaration *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 10 Jun]* 44
Lobov Comments on Joint Enterprises Oil Export Ban *[Russian TV]* 45
Paper Views New Arrangements for Land Sale, Purchase *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 5 Jun]* 45
Food, Other Price Increases for May Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 9 Jun]* 45

Supreme Soviet

Threat to Khasbulatov 'Should Not Be Exaggerated' *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 9 Jun]* 46
Subcommittee Will Monitor Progress of Military Legislation *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Jun]* 47

Regional Affairs

Yekaterinburg Council Building Attacked by Grenade Launcher *[ITAR-TASS]* 47
Sakhalin Oblast Soviet Deputy on Situation in Kurils *[Vladivostok Radio]* 47
Economic Crisis Prompts Mass Exodus From Kuril Islands *[ITAR-TASS]* 48

Stavropol Governor Asked To Oust 'Old Nomenklatura' *[IZVESTIYA 8 Jun]* 48
Attempt To Sell Army Weapons in Stavropol Cut Short *[Russian TV]* 48
Siberian Regions Agree To Seek Equal Status *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 8 Jun]* 49
Vorkuta Miners To Start General Strike 11 June *[Russian TV]* 49

UKRAINE

International Affairs

Kravchuk Sends Delegation to Geneva Disarmament Talks *[URYADOVYY KURYER 8 Jun]* 50
Expert Examines Question of Republic's Nuclear Status *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 10 Jun]* 50
Legal Expert Favors Keeping Nuclear Status *[HOLOS UKRAYINY 8 Jun]* 51
Navy Criticizes Transfer of Black Sea Civilian Staff *[Kiev Radio]* 53
Defense Ministry Assails TV Report on Nuclear Maintenance *[UKRINFORM]* 53
Germany's Kohl Ends Visit; Agreements Concluded *[Kiev International]* 53
Meets Plyushch, Backs Reforms *[ITAR-TASS]* 53
German Minister Apologizes for 'Illegal' Toxic Waste Dumping *[Hamburg DPA]* 54

National Affairs

Kravchuk Says Government Resignation 'Out of the Question' *[ITAR-TASS]* 54
Warns Against 'End of Democracy' *[UNIAN]* 54
Government Orders Examination of Miners' Demands *[Kiev Radio]* 55
Kharkov Oblast Supports Striking Donbass Miners Demands *[UKRINFORM]* 55
Strike Official Calls Vice Premier's Speech 'Provocation' *[UNIAN]* 55
Lugansk Miners Call For Donbass Independence *[UNIAR]* 55
Semenov Back From Moscow With Proposals for Kravchuk *[UKRINFORM]* 56

WESTERN REGION

Belarus

U.S. Special Envoy Talbott Arrives in Minsk *[ITAR-TASS]* 57
Holds 'Polite' Talks With Shushkevich *[BELINFORM]* 57
Government Pledges To Withhold First Use of Nuclear Weapons *[ITAR-TASS]* 57
Republic Hit by 'Severe' Economic Crisis *[Moscow TV]* 57
Consulate General Opens in London *[ITAR-TASS]* 58

Moldova

U.S. Envoy Talbott Arrives in Moldova *[ITAR-TASS]* 58
Meets Snegur, Discusses Reform *[BASAPRESS]* 58
Tiraspol Government Pleads for 'Idea of Confederation' *[BASAPRESS]* 58
Lalumiere Pleads for 'Fair Trial' of Detainees *[BASAPRESS]* 58

CENTRAL ASIA

Kyrgyzstan

Akayev: Reforms 'Impossible' Without Russian Cooperation *[ITAR-TASS]* 59
Agreement Signed With Poland; Walesa Invited To Visit *[Moscow Radio]* 59
Military Questions Need for Own Armed Forces *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Jun]* 59

Tajikistan

State of Emergency Suspended for By-Elections *[Dushanbe Radio]* 59

CAUCASUS

Armenia

Russian Delegation's Visit Detailed *[Yerevan International]* 61
Kozyrev Meets With Karabakh Officials *[SNARK]* 61
Foreign Minister To Address Athens NATO Conference *[SNARK]* 61
Russian Envoy Visits Armenian, Russian Border Guards *[SNARK]* 61

Azerbaijan

Aliyev Reportedly Refuses Premiership *[AFP]* 62
Aliyev's Rejection of Premiership Denied *[ITAR-TASS]* 62
Guseynov's Supporters Demand Government Resignation *[Ankara TV]* 62
Press Service Says Situation Stabilizing in Gyandzha *[ITAR-TASS]* 63
Deputies Approve Amnesty Proposal for Gyandzha Participants *[TURAN]* 63
APF Supporters Release Deputies Held in Parliament Building *[TURAN]* 63
United Nations Resolution 822 Viewed *[ASSA-IRADA]* 63
Visiting Russian Deputies Discuss Ties, Convicted Soldiers *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 10 Jun]* .. 64
Karabakh's Petrosyan Interviewed on 'Official' Position *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 9 Jun]* 64

Georgia

Kozyrev's Visit Fails To Halt Fighting in Abkhazia *[Tbilisi Radio]* 64
Abkhaz Leader: Russians 'Cannot Be Fully Trusted' *[Tbilisi Radio]* 65
Shevardnadze Hints at 'Strong-Arm' Solution to Abkhazia *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Jun]* 66
Shevardnadze Directive on Armed Forces *[SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA 28 May]* 66
Secret Service Wants International Cooperation *[CONTACT INFORMATION AGENCY]* 68
South Ossetian Leaders Urge Reunification With North *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 10 Jun]* 68

BALTIC STATES

Estonia

Talks With Russia Assessed; Gas Accord Initialed *[BNS]* 70
Luik To Raise Territorial Issue With Russia *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 10 Jun]* 70
Comments on Talks *[Tallinn Radio]* 71
Ship Carrying Israeli Arms Arrives at Tallinn Port *[Tel Aviv HA'ARETZ 8 Jun]* 71
New Border Guard Chief Appointed *[Tallinn Radio]* 71

Latvia

Government To Wait on Purchasing Israeli Arms *[BNS]* 71
Russia Said Reluctant To Turn Over Military Housing *[BNS]* 72
Foreign Minister Leaves for Athens Conference *[Riga Radio]* 72
Belarusian Envoy Presents Credentials to Gorbunovs *[BNS]* 72

Lithuania

Russia's Grachev Demands Compensation for Army Property *[LIETUVOS AIDAS 19 May]* 72
Russian Troops Said Getting Serious About Withdrawal *[Vilnius International]* 73
Lalumiere on Country's Admission to European Council *[LIETUVOS AIDAS 14 May]* 73
Brazauskas To Visit France, Switzerland *[Vilnius International]* 74
President Names First Ambassador to Kiev *[HOLOS UKRAYINY 8 Jun]* 74

Council of Defense Ministers To Meet 15 Jun

LD1106100193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0856 GMT 11 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Andrey Naryshkin]

[Text] Moscow June 11 TASS—A regular meeting of the CIS Council of Defence Ministers will be held at the headquarters of the Chief Command of the CIS Allied Armed Forces on June 15.

The defence ministers will discuss draft resolutions on enhancing combat efficiency of the CIS member states, the creation of a collective security system, draft agreements on CIS allied armed forces and a resolution on the general (executive) secretary of the CIS Security Council, a spokesman for the CIS Chief Command told ITAR-TASS today. A separate item of the agenda envisages the discussion of priority tasks within the framework of the implementation of the Tashkent collective security treaty.

Air Force Marshal Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, commander-in-chief of the CIS allied armed forces, will make a report at the meeting.

Latvian Observers View 'Baltic Operation 93' Exercises

WS1106113793 Riga LETA in English 1000 GMT 11 June 93

[Text] Riga, June 11 (LETA)—On Friday [11 June] a patrol aircraft of Latvian air forces took the Commander of Latvian defence forces, Dainis Turlais, and the Deputy Commander of the Latvian navy, Janis Adamsons, to Liepaya to observe from above the sea manoeuvres performed by war ships of the Baltic Sea countries and organized by the U.S. Navy. The manoeuvres, called the "Baltic Operation 93", started on Tuesday off the Danish coast and involved all the Baltic Sea. On Friday the squadron of warships will move around in the Latvian economic zone.

The observers from Latvia naval forces are also participating in the manouevres watching how the U.S., Swedish, Danish and Polish crews perform various operations, including coast-guard surveillance, ecological monitoring, rescue operations, etc. There are also three observers from Estonia attending the "Baltic Operation 93".

Slav Republic Border Oblasts To Set Up Unified Ruble Zone

PM1106091593 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jun 93 p 2

[Anatoliy Grachev report: "Klintsy Versus Belovezhskaya Forest"]

[Text] Bryansk Oblast—A meeting held yesterday in the city of Klintsy, in the Bryansk region, brought together leaders of Gomel, Mogilev, Chernigov, Sumy, and Bryansk Oblasts. Initially they had just one purpose—to reach agreement on how best to hold the traditional festival at the monument to friendship on the border between Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus. But the striped swing barriers which met them on the way and, in effect, divide the Slav peoples widened the topic of conversation, from which I will cite just a few extracts:

"It is simply essential for us to reestablish economic ties. Politicians come and go, but we have to live as neighbors. We cannot get by without friendship and mutually advantageous relations."

"I have given orders to the militia not to search Russian bags. We should not be building customs houses but removing them."

"The euphoria of Ukrainian separatism [samostikhiynost] is passing. Today I see life differently. In the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, political ambitions are put higher than the interests of the people. There are no reciprocal payments nowadays. The accounts are closed. Trains do not run to neighboring oblasts. Who wants this?"

The result of this meeting will be a specific economic agreement. It is planned to create a single unified zone between neighboring oblasts of Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus, and also to renew cooperation between oblast soviets and administrations. How can one help recalling the words which the great Gogol put into the mouth of Taras Bulba: "We have been left orphaned, like the land we live in. This is the time we have chosen to hold out our hands in the spirit of fraternity, comrades."

ITAR-TASS Carries Press Review for 11 Jun

LD1106060593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0555 GMT 11 Jun 93

["Press Review"—ITAR-TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 11 ITAR-TASS—Newspapers publish articles dealing with two memorable dates: on June 12 Russians will observe the independence day. Three years ago the first Russian Congress of People's Deputies was held. A year later, on June 12, 1991, the first Russian president was elected.

TRUD points out that the past three years were eventful ones for Russia, and "it became evident that not everything is so clear and obvious with the gaining of independence." Nikolay Travkin, leader of the Democratic Party of Russia, said in a TRUD interview that for him the notions of sovereignty and independence of Russia meant at the same time the disintegration of the Soviet Union. "I am sure that disintegration process was not an objective one. A normal transformation could have taken place with the rights of union republics being expanded," Travkin believes.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA quotes Deputy Prime Minister Sergey Shakhray as saying that one type of the state is now being replaced by another. "Three factors will save Russia's statehood—the economic reform, federalism and extensive local self-government," Shakhray believes.

Vitaliy Tretyakov, editor-in-chief of NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA, analyses in his article two years of Yeltsin's presidency. In his opinion, the fact that "the reform is being implemented in the country without bloodshed" is the main accomplishment of Yeltsin's policy.

NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA carries a large analytical article by Aleksey Kiva, a well-known political scientist, which is entitled "Gorbachev and Gorbachev's Supported on the Crucial Stage of Russian History." Analysing the role of prominent Russian politicians, he writes that "to hold Yeltsin responsible for the disintegration of the Soviet Union is as ridiculous as to accuse Gorbachev of having started perestroyka, following the instructions of the CIA or some other foreign intelligence service."

The press continues to give wide coverage to problems dealing with the drafting and adoption of the new Russian constitution. According to NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA, three ways of federal setup were submitted for the consideration of the conference's workshops. "The first one is Russia as a union state. The second one is a federation with its constituent members enjoying absolutely equal rights, both political and economic. The third is the one we are having today."

The army newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA writes that in the process of drafting a new Russian constitution "two irreconcilable forces have come together. The first impression was that none of them would yield, while now they are already looking for compromises. All passions and hurt feelings will be forgotten, and the most important thing will remain, cannot but remain: the need always to give priority to the interests of Russia, of the Russian people."

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA gives wide coverage to the training assembly of Russian military leaders held in Moscow, which was addressed by President Yeltsin. The newspaper carries a large article about it, which is entitled "Army Passed the Test and Now Capable of Implementing Full-Scale Reform".

The press publishes reports on the latest developments in Azerbaijan and Armenia. A TRUD correspondent reports from Baku that after a meeting of Azeri President Abulfaz Elchibey and the former communist leader of the republic Geydar Aliyev the latter was offered the post of prime minister with broad prerogatives.

A NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA correspondent reports from Yerevan that after the visit to the Armenian capital of Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev and other Russian officials last Wednesday and Thursday and the talks they held with Armenian and Nagorno-Karabakh leaders "some high-ranking Armenian diplomats got the impression that Nagorno-Karabakh would give a positive answer to the main question—on the withdrawal of the self-defence troops from the Kelbadzhar district of Azerbaijan".

PRAVDA carries an interview with former chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Anatoliy Lukyanov, now one of the defendants on the State Emergency Committee Case. He shares his ideas about ways of "getting out of the constitutional deadlock".

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA publishes fragments from the report of chairman of the Russian parliament Ruslan Khasbulatov at the parliamentary session under the headline "Why War Has Been Declared on People's Power".

Yeltsin Requests Chernomyrdin Postpone U.S. Visit

LD1106103893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0929 GMT 11 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Sergey Podyapolskiy]

[Text] Moscow June 11 TASS—Viktor Chernomyrdin's visit to the United States, scheduled for mid-June, has been postponed, Russian Deputy Prime Minister Aleksandr Shokhin said at a press conference today. According to Shokhin, President Yeltsin asked Chernomyrdin to continue to attend the Constitutional Conference.

A new date of the visit, June 28-29, has been agreed upon in a preliminary way. However, the American side would like to settle before the visit the "delicate" problem of the control regime for the non-proliferation of missile technologies in connection with Russian-Indian talks about the sale of missile engines to India, Shokhin continued. "This is why the visit will depend on the settlement of that problem," the deputy prime minister pointed out.

Foreign Minister Kozyrev Leaves for Athens

LD1006151993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1451 GMT 10 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondent Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Moscow June 10 TASS—Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev left for Greece on Thursday [10 June] for an official visit. While in Athens, he is to attend a meeting of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council.

The council, which was set up in late 1991 with a view to improve relations between European countries, groups 38 states, including 16 NATO member countries, Russia and other former Soviet republics, and East European countries. The first meeting of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council at the foreign ministers level was held in December 1991.

Arrives for North Atlantic Council Meeting

LD1006201393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1951 GMT 10 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vladimir Malyshev]

[Text] Athens June 10 TASS—Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev has arrived in Athens on Thursday [10 June].

On June 11, he will take part in the session of the Council of North Atlantic Cooperation. An official visit of the Russian foreign minister to Greece will take place on June 12-14.

Soyuz-4 Fishing Boat Taken to PRC Naval Base

OW1006220593 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 1300 GMT 10 Jun 93

[From the "News" program]

[Text] We have just received news on the Russian Soyuz-4 fishing boat which disappeared on 9 June. It has been found that the vessel was seized 120 nautical miles from the Chinese coast by a speed boat. According to a briefing by the Information Center of the Russian Federation's Committee for Fishing today, 20 of the speed boat's crewmembers, armed with automatic weapons, boarded the Russian vessel. The crew of the Soyuz-4 fishing boat was rounded up into the crew's quarters, while the boat was escorted to a Chinese (?naval base) near Ningbo. No charges have been made against the crew.

This is not the first attack [xi ji] on Russian fishing boats by Chinese warships. The Russian Federation's Committee for Fishing has lodged a protest and is demanding the fishing boat's release and the return of the entire crew.

Chinese Attitude 'Worsened'

LD1106084093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0642 GMT 11 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Lents]

[Text] Vladivostok June 11 TASS—After the news about the capture of the Russian fishing boat Soyuz-4 was made public, the attitude of the Chinese towards the crew dramatically worsened. This follows from the latest reports from the Soyuz-4 that were transmitted illegally, with the help of the boat radio station on emergency frequencies.

The radio report was received by the Chempion tanker flying the Liberian flag, which nevertheless has a Russian crew. The Chempion sent the radiogram to the Russian ambassador in Beijing and transmitted a report for the Far Eastern Rescue and Coordination Centre, adding that there would be no further communication, since the boat radio station was detected and confiscated. The Russian fishing boat Soyuz-4, which was reported missing in the East China Sea on the night of June 9, was arrested by a Chinese naval launch.

According to the information received today, the Soyuz-4 is kept on the outside roadstead of the Putua-Nimbo naval base of China. The log-book and all the ship's documents were confiscated from Viktor Kulikov, captain of the boat, under the threat of using automatic weapons. The on-board radio station was sealed. Four men armed with submachine-guns are continually staying on board the Soyuz-4.

The trawler was arrested in the international waters, outside the territorial waters of China. It carried on board several second-hand Japanese cars, household

electronic appliances and other personal belongings of fishermen, bought in Japan. Now all of them are sealed. In the opinion of the captain, they will be used as a pretext for the arrest of the fishing boat, which the Chinese side is now desperately inventing.

Twelve Russian ships have got into the same situation in South East Asian since the beginning of the year. [sentence as received] In ten cases the ships were attacked by Chinese naval and civilian boats.

Negotiator on Talks With PRC on Disputed Islands

PM1106104593 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Jun 93 p 3

[Viktor Sokirko report: "Islands Will Evidently Pass to Neighbors. But Russian Population Must Be Compensated for Losses"]

[Text] A routine meeting of representatives of the Russian-Chinese Joint Border Demarcation Commission has been held in the border population center of Hailar, which is on Chinese territory. Our border guards, representatives of the Russian Federation Ministry of Defense, and Foreign Ministry staffers participated in the meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to reach agreement on the lines of three borders—Russian, Chinese, and Mongolian—and also to resolve the question of carrying out field topogeodesic work.

The fate of almost 400 islands in the Argun and Amur Rivers has so far remained undecided. They have been the stumbling block in relations between Russian and Chinese border regions. Genrikh Kireyev, roving ambassador and head of the Russian delegation on the Russian-Chinese joint commission, who has been there, declared that the most difficult situation on the eastern border is on its Chita section. There the interests of the local population are affected most of all. We have been there and spoken with residents, the ambassador said. The most determined people are those who live near Island 279 (or, as they call it, Menkeseli) and the large Island 280, for it is only in the region of the river that there is feed for livestock, hunting land, and a place for fishing. If they pass to the neighbors (everything is moving toward just this), this means that villages will empty, and the border region will be left without a population.

Where is the way out? Some things have already been done. Thus, access to the islands has been made considerably easier. Explanatory work has been carried out among the local population. In the future it is necessary to think about their joint utilization for economic and trade purposes. Incidentally, a trade center has been constructed on Lopatin Island, but it is not yet in use because there is no mechanism to regulate trade.

Further, if the islands pass to China, the local population must be compensated for losses. For five years (this is the time set aside for carrying out demarcation work), while the islands are Russian, everything must be done to ensure that our people's legitimate rights are not infringed. This is the aim that the Russian representatives on the Russian-Chinese joint commission set themselves.

South Kuril Islands Face Energy Shortages

LD1006161693 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1349 GMT 10 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Belovitskiy]

[Text] Yuzhno-Kurilsk June 10 TASS—The military and border guards on the South Kuril Islands have run out of last reserves of diesel fuel. Nikolay Pokidin, the mayor of South Kuril region, said that the energy supply on the Kuril Islands is not enough even to warm food for newly born babies.

Pokidin told ITAR-TASS that most of residents of the Kuril Islands would have left the islands immediately if there were ships and containers to pack their things in order to get away. According to Pokidin, the latest documents adopted by the president, the parliament and the Russian Government on the socio-economic development of the Kuril Islands do not work at all.

The South Kuril Islands have been going through energy crisis for over three months. Telegrams sent to regional and central authorities desperately asking for help have been to no avail. A promise made by the Japanese Government to supply 1,500 tonnes of diesel fuel as humanitarian aid for residents of Kunashir, Shikotan and Iturup Islands has not been fulfilled yet.

An extremely tense situation caused by energy shortages has prompted Shikotan people's deputies to appeal to the Governments of Russia and Japan to decide the fate of the islands and its population until July 1, 1993. If no cardinal measures are taken, deputies intend to appeal to the world public.

Russian Businessman Refused Entry to Hokkaido

LD1006125193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1103 GMT 10 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Belovitskiy]

[Text] Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk June 10 TASS—A Russian citizen, Valentin Smorchkov, former director general of a Russian-Austrialian joint venture, has been refused entry into Hokkaido by Japanese authorities who gave the understanding that they will not allow any foreign investments in the "Northern Territories".

Smorchkov was supposed to be the leader of a delegation of Kuril Islands inhabitants which left today for the Japanese island of Hokkaido on a visa-free exchange program. Smorchkov left his position at Soviden Fischer Company in early June, but this did not soften Japan's position.

Smorchkov said the incident was "open discrimination". "The Kurils are under Russian jurisdiction, and it is not for the Japanese to decide who will work there", he added. The mayor of Yuzhno-Kuril region, Nikolay Pokidin, called the affair interference in the internal affairs of the region.

Yastrzhembskiy Clarifies Stance on 'Safe Areas'

PM1006150993 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jun 93 First Edition p 1

[Nikolay Yermolovich report: "Moscow Will Only Send Servicemen to Bosnia As Observers"]

[Excerpt] IZVESTIYA has already informed its readers that Russia has refused to send its troops to Bosnia-Herzegovina. Attention was, moreover, drawn to the Russian Foreign Ministry's silence—the news came from Paris.

The explanation has now arrived. S. Yastrzhembskiy, director of the Foreign Ministry Information and Press Department, viewed the Security Council resolution on creating "safe areas" in Bosnia-Herzegovina as a specific step toward implementing the joint action program adopted in Washington for the phased implementation of the Vance-Owen plan. Commenting on Lord Owen's statement in Paris regarding the change in Russia's stance and Moscow's reluctance to send its troops to protect the "safe areas," the department's director said that the Washington joint action program "does not say anything about the Russian Federation's pledging to send its troops to defend 'safe areas.'" People in Moscow believe that there may be "other parameters for Russian Federation participation in UN operations in Bosnia." Russian servicemen may be needed, S. Yastrzhembskiy pointed out, when observers are stationed on the Bosnian border, for instance.

The Russian Foreign Ministry fully agrees with the stance espoused by Russian Defense Minister P. Grachev, who believes that we do not need a "second Afghanistan" and that the outcome of the Yugoslav crisis is unpredictable in the event of an escalation in military operations. But, if the Vance-Owen plan is adopted, the Foreign Ministry would then consider it supremely useful for our troops to participate in the UN forces, the Russian flag to appear there, and for us to gain much needed experience in peacemaking operations. Thus, Russia's stance remains the same: Russia is agreeable to taking part in the UN forces in Bosnia-Herzegovina, but on definite, previously agreed terms.

Ukrainian 'Hawks' Berated for Black Sea Fleet Stance

PM1006120193 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jun 93 p 3

[Nikolay Musiyenko report: "Hawks Circling Over the Fleet"]

[Text] The storm warning from the Black Sea has been heeded. The raising of the St. Andrew's flag over the 200 or so Black Sea Fleet ships has finally made the leadership of the two republics "get moving."

Last week A. Kozyrev and A. Zlenko, the heads of their foreign policy departments, arrived in Sevastopol to prepare for a summit.

The Russian and Ukrainian presidents' views on the problems of the Black Sea Fleet coincide to a considerable extent, the Russian Federation foreign minister asserted in a speech to officers at the Black Sea Fleet Headquarters. We are beginning to resolve this deadlock, his Ukrainian colleague reaffirmed. But neither of them revealed his "hand" ahead of time. At any rate, the forthcoming decision of the presidential "duo" is hardly likely to please everyone.

Here is the view of Admiral F. Gromov, commander in chief of the Russian Navy:

"Only Sevastopol can be the base for the Russian Navy in the Black Sea. There can be no question of moving the main Black Sea Fleet base to Novorossiysk simply because it will be impossible to create all the necessary infrastructure there within the next 50 years..."

"Let's be frank: Russia will not be leaving Sevastopol any time soon. That is the reality. So we must take payment from Russia for that reality... They should pay for the use of the naval base in the same way as the Americans pay the Philippines and other countries," Ukrainian Prime Minister L. Kuchma proposed at a Ukrainian Supreme Soviet session.

As we can see, there is room for compromise in those statements. But, regrettably, the Ukrainian military department in the shape of Defense Minister K. Morozov, who is "famed" for his hard-line stance, is sticking to the same old policy. "There can be no question of dividing up our land or leasing our cities," the minister stated again at a recent meeting with journalists.

The political hawks do not understand (or pretend that they do not) that the artificial stoking of confrontation between two Slavic states and the "clumsy" division of the Black Sea Fleet merely plays into the hands of our Western "friends."

Khasbulatov Address Urges Settlement

LD1006174993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1439 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Text] Moscow, June 10 (TASS)—Russian Parliament Speaker Ruslan Khasbulatov made an address on Thursday [10 June], pointing out the increasingly dangerous developments around the Black Sea Fleet.

"As chairman of the Russian Parliament and chairman of the Council of the CIS Interparliamentary Assembly, I call upon the governments of Russia and Ukraine to take resolute measures for the settlement of the crisis. I

call upon all people of the good will to pool their efforts to achieve the soonest settlement of the crisis and prevent it from turning into an interstate conflict which is fraught with unpredictable consequences. The Black Sea should be an arena of good-neighbourly relations and business partnership, rather than the source of discord. There is no doubt that it is possible to find ways out of the deadlock by political means only, by means of talks on the basis of observing international law and commitments envisaged in bilateral agreements, on the basis of historical justice and respect for mutual interests of our people," the address said.

Kasatonov, Ukrainian Officials on Issue

MK1106095093 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 11 Jun 93 p 3

[Aleksandr Pilat report under "Crimea" rubric: "'Russia Has No Other Base in Black Sea Except Sevastopol.' Admiral Igor Kasatonov, First Lieutenant Commander in Chief of the Russian Federation Navy, Sticks to His Guns"]

[Text] The Black Sea Fleet's newspaper FLAG RODINY has published an interview with Admiral Igor Kasatonov, first lieutenant commander in chief of the Russian Federation Navy, up until recently commander of the Black Sea Fleet. The interview is titled: "The Situation Is at a Deadlock. Optimum Solutions Are Needed That Would Suit Both Russia and Ukraine."

Admiral Kasatonov adheres to his former position ("the Black Sea Fleet is impossible to divide") and he blames all of the fleet's present misfortunes on the Ukrainian naval security forces, the armed forces, the Ukrainian Defense Ministry, and personally the minister, Colonel General Konstantin Morozov. As a result of their ill-conceived actions, Kasatonov argues, a situation has been created "that has gone out of control." The admiral approves of the raising of St. Andrew's flags on the Fleet's support vessels and notes that today "all the remaining combat ships and units are ready to raise St. Andrew's flags."

The admiral is sure: "Problems should be decided only at the negotiating table." He is convinced, however, that the talks between interstate delegations on the Black Sea Fleet have come to a deadlock because "the unilateral wishes that the members of the Ukrainian state delegation sought to impose did not respond to Russia's interests.... Russia has no other port or base in the Black Sea except Sevastopol. This has been so for centuries. Russia has a perfectly clear-cut, concrete economic base for the fleet which can support it even at the present time."

Kasatonov sums up: "The situation is at a deadlock, and this deadlock will lead to uncontrollable, ungovernable actions. Optimal decisions are needed that would suit both Russia and Ukraine."

The interview does not say anything about the possibility of leasing the Sevastopol naval base. Kasatonov favors joint use of the base by Russia and Ukraine and maintains the idea of a single Black Sea Fleet under combined command."

NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA's correspondent contacted Ivan Yermakov, the Ukrainian president's representative in Sevastopol, and asked him to respond to a few questions.

[Pilat] How do you envision the solution of the Black Sea Fleet problem? What do you think about the leasing of the naval base in Sevastopol to Russia?

[Yermakov] In my opinion, the question of territorial division should not be raised now. This may mean death. I can see a foundation on which we could reach agreement. As an option I do not rule out the possibility of leasing part of the territory for Russian naval bases—either in Sevastopol or in Donuzlav or in Kerch and Feodosia.

[Pilat] What would be your comment on Admiral Kasatonov's statement that it is impossible to divide the Black Sea Fleet?

[Yermakov] I think that first of all it is necessary to define the Fleet's status: Russian means Russian, and Ukrainian means Ukrainian. But these are two different fleets: this is clear, obvious, and understandable. Each has its own status and its own command. This would resolve the problem by half. And then the remaining questions could be dealt with on the basis of agreement. [Yermakov ends]

The Ukrainian Defense Ministry press service told NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA's correspondent: "The Ukrainian Defense Ministry regards the raising of St. Andrew's flags as a violation of the Yalta agreement; it is surprised that Admiral Kasatonov approves of these actions." NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA's correspondent was also told with respect to leasing the Sevastopol naval base to Russia: "The press service is authorized to state that this decision would not respond to the defense needs of our state and would not be acceptable to Ukraine. The Ukrainian Defense Ministry believes that there can be no question about dividing Ukrainian land or leasing Ukrainian towns."

Captain First Rank Vladimir Volodin, chairman of the coordinating council of the Black Sea Fleet officers assemblies, told NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA's correspondent that the Ukrainian defense department is guilty of aggravating the situation and that he is convinced that the raising of St. Andrew's flags should not be regarded as a political act—"this is a retaliatory, forced form of protest."

Vladimir Volodin also said that the Fleet officers assembly meeting, scheduled for 10 June, had been canceled. That was done in order to ensure a favorable atmosphere at the talks between the Russian and the

Ukrainian presidents on the issue of the Black Sea Fleet. The coordinating council of officers assemblies of the Black Sea Fleet has appealed to fleet seamen and servicemen "to maintain restraint and circumspection, adhere to the position that the complicated questions concerning the fleet can only be resolved via negotiating processes on the interstate level."

Emergency Committee Team Flies to Sukhumi

LD1106101393 Moscow Programma Radio Odin Network in Russian 0730 GMT 11 Jun 93

[Text] Members of the Russian Committee for Emergency Situations' operational group fly out to Sukhumi for talks today. Yesterday, consultations were held in Sukhumi with the Abkhaz leadership. According to Yuriy Vorobyev, first deputy chairman of the State Committee for Emergency Situations, the main questions concerned with the delivery of humanitarian aid to Tkvarcheli by land have been solved.

Air Force Wives Stage Runway Protest at Base in Belarus

PM1106090193 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jun 93 p 4

[Oleg Stepanenko report: "Women on Runway"]

[Text] Minsk—Not one aircraft has been able to take off from the military airfield near the town of Lida in the Grodno area. Its runway has been blocked by servicemen's wives. This foiled an attempt to relocate the regiment to Russia, where the servicemen's wives would be without accommodations. This dramatic situation is typical of the air force units located on Belarusian territory but still under Russian jurisdiction following the collapse of the Union and the Army. PRAVDA described the drama of one such air regiment in the article "Ballet Without a Landing" (22 May). The women of the Lida air garrison intend to fight to the finish. They plan to set up a camp site on the runway.

Kozyrev Welcomes 'Increasingly Mature' Ties With Kyrgyzstan

PM1006130193 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 9 Jun 93 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Russia-Kyrgyzstan"]

[Text] There are no acute or nagging problems between our countries, no serious differences. We resolve any questions that arise in bilateral relations in a businesslike manner and in a friendly atmosphere, as was confirmed once again by the present meeting. This was stated by Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev at the end of his talks with his Kyrgyz colleague Ednan Karbayev.

In particular, the Russian minister expressed satisfaction that the sides had achieved mutual understanding on the question of the need to guarantee the rights of the Russian-speaking population in the Republic of Kyrgyzstan and on a number of regional issues, including the situation in Tajikistan. "Our collaboration is assuming increasingly mature forms and visible dimensions," he stressed.

Results of Russian-Estonian Talks in Moscow Analyzed

News Conference on Talks

PM1106092193 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Jun 93 First Edition p 3

[Konstantin Eggert report: "Russia and Estonia Have Difficulty Finding Common Language"]

[Text] At a news conference at the Estonian Republic embassy on the results of the 12th round of Russian-Estonian talks, the delegation heads did not tire of recalling the existing profound conflicts between Moscow and Tallinn.

While the Russian side's spokesman, Roving Ambassador Vasiliy Svirin, stated that "I am far from optimistic," Estonian delegation leader and plenipotentiary minister Juri Luik on the contrary called the talks' results "fruitful." He cited as an example completion of work on the treaty on social support for military pensioners and their family members living in the Estonian Republic, and the initialing of an agreement on trade and economic cooperation for this year.

Humanitarian questions were not discussed during the 12th round. On the one hand, the talks' agenda was already full, and on the other the discussions of this problem have become obviously deadlocked. Ambassador Svirin said that the situation in this sphere "is causing him pain." He specially noted the law on elections to local self-government organs recently adopted by the Estonian parliament, according to which noncitizens have the right to vote but cannot be elected. Luik in turn pointed out: "The law fully accords with international law and does not signify discrimination against people on ethnic grounds. The Estonian delegation leader considered it necessary to point out the infringement of ethnic Estonians' rights in Pechorskiy Rayon, which remains the subject of a territorial dispute between the two states. They, Luik claims, do not have the opportunity to be taught in their native language.

The most noticeable differences between Moscow and Tallinn are on the question of the Russian troop withdrawal. Minister Luik believes the treaty on this is virtually ready, and as soon as a withdrawal date is agreed all that remains is to solve minor technical problems. Svirin categorically disagrees with him, believing that the fate of the former Soviet Army's real estate on Estonian territory, just as the question of compensation for the ecological damage caused by our troops, will require serious discussion.

In fact, the sides are setting absolutely different deadlines for the Russian military's withdrawal: 1 August 1993 (Estonia) and the end of 1994 (Russia). Luik drew journalists' attention to the recent comments by Russian Defense Minister Pavel Grachev on the possibility of completing the troop withdrawal by the end of this year if all problems concerning the provision of social amenities for them have been eliminated. However, Svirin declined to discuss Grachev's statement.

The next round of talks is scheduled to be held in Tallinn 7-8 July.

Border Questions Said 'Complex'

PM1106090193 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Jun 93 p 1

[Sergey Knyazkov report: "Military and Border Questions Are Most Complex. Latest Round of Russian-Estonian Talks Has Ended"]

[Text] To all appearances, the Estonian delegation arrived in Moscow for the 12th round of talks with Russia with a definite aim. This, according to Juri Luik, head of the Estonian delegation, was connected with the statement which Army General Pavel Grachev made during the 18 May Vilnius meeting of the Russian and Estonian defense ministers to the effect that, if social questions can be resolved for the servicemen who are to be withdrawn, then the troops will be able to leave Estonia by the end of 1993.

During the talks, the Estonian side actively sought to develop that statement by the Russian Federation minister of defense. In the final protocol of the meeting the delegation heads noted that all the Russian side's positions in connection with Pavel Grachev's statement will be shaped finally by 25 June, specifically with regard to the extent of Estonia's financial assistance in constructing housing for Russian servicemen. Of course, we do not want to link everything to financial questions, Juri Luik emphasized, but we understand perfectly that this would make a substantial contribution to moving the talks toward a basic treaty on the troop withdrawal.

Although Juri Luik pointed out at the final news conference that the basic treaty "has essentially been prepared, and only technical problems remain to be solved," Vasiliy Svirin, head of the Russian delegation, did not quite agree with this, since the troop withdrawal schedule has not been agreed upon. In addition to these disagreements, however, the sides also hold diametrically opposite attitudes on the Russian Army's real estate in Estonia and the troops' status. For Estonia continues to insist that the Russian troops are now on the republic's territory illegally, i.e. they are occupation troops. Naturally, this is rejected by the Russian side.

Just one agreement was initialed during the present round of talks—on trade and economic relations between Russia and Estonia for 1993. But the discussion of a draft intergovernmental agreement on social protection for military pensioners and members of their families permanently resident in Estonia is already practically complete. It is to be presented for initialing at the next meeting of the two delegations, which will take place in Tallinn 13-14 June.

In the opinion of Vasiliy Svirin, during the past few rounds the sides succeeded in initialing documents exclusively of an economic nature because "the Estonian side has an interest in this." But there has been "virtually no progress" on those issues in which the Estonians are less interested.

The most painful problem is the territorial one. At the end of April the Estonian Ministry of Foreign Affairs published a number of documents which described Pskov Oblast's Pechorskiy Rayon as "a rayon partially under Russian control, which belongs to Estonia in accordance with the 1920 Peace Treaty." In the previous round of talks Estonia refused to recognize the city of Pechory as the seat of the Russian border representative on the pretext that it is "located on Estonian territory." Although, as both Svirin and Luik emphasized at the news conference, both sides are now "prepared to freeze the theoretical dispute over who owns territories," so far no progress has been made on any of the agreements concerning border problems (these are the draft agreements on the border, on the demarcation of the economic zone and the territorial shelf, on livelihood provisions to contiguous territories, and on the procedure for crossing the border). This was obviously why, assessing the results of the latest round of talks, Vasiliy Svirin emphasized that they are "a long way from optimism."

Estonia Optimistic About Troop Withdrawal

LD0906153193 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 1700 GMT 8 Jun 93

[Text] Another round of Estonian-Russian talks ended at Nakhabino, near Moscow. We have Juri Luik, leader of the Estonian delegation, on the telephone.

[Luik] Today the 12th round of talks came to an end. The subjects discussed were, in principle, the same as at previous rounds, with the main attention on the troop withdrawal, on the basic agreement on the troop withdrawal, and on the agreement concerning pensioners of the Russian army, as well as the technical agreement concerning the Paldiski [naval base in Estonia], the removal of the reactor, and the agreement on the compensation to be paid by the Russian Army...[announcer corrects himself] the Russian state to Estonia for the weapons confiscated in 1940. A group of people worked separately on the ecological damage caused to the Estonian state by the Russian Army. All the agreements were discussed thoroughly and many compromise solutions were found. The agreement on Paldiski in particular also concerned the major basic agreement on troop withdrawal.

Attention was also paid to the diplomatic activity which has taken place between the past two rounds, both the meeting of Defense Minister Grachev and Defense Minister Rebas in Vilnius and the visit of Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Adamishin to Estonia. As a result of these visits and the diplomatic activity, the Russian Federation proposed a new deadline for the troop withdrawal, which is the end of December 1993, a date which the Estonian delegation is willing to discuss.

During the (?day), the technical details for the troop withdrawal were discussed and the Russian Federation emphasized that we are talking first and foremost about financial problems. The Russian Federation is incapable of building sufficient housing for the withdrawing officers. The Russian Federation agreed to make available by 25 June to the Estonian Government official information on the kind of assistance required so that the troops will be withdrawn from Estonia in the course of the year, evidently by the end of the year. We expect this information by 25 June, and naturally, we will consult our Western partners, and then reply whether we can help or not.

So, there has been some progress following the meeting between Pavel Grachev and Hain Rebas. The Russian Federation at least did not go back on its offer and emphasized that if the technical problems to do with the construction of housing are resolved, one can indeed talk about a deadline of 31 December.

Fedorov Leads Delegation at Bulgarian Trade Talks

LD1006154093 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 0800 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Correspondent Dmitriy Golovanov report; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] This is the first sitting of the Russian-Bulgarian intergovernmental commission for trade, economic, and scientific and technical cooperation. The very fact that a dialogue between Bulgaria and Russia has been renewed at the suggestion of the presidents of our states, a sphere that literally affects each of us—trade and economic ties—means a great deal. Unfortunately, the exchange of mutual deliveries of goods decreased nine-fold last year alone. Deputy Prime Minister Boris Fedorov, head of the Russian delegation, sees real possibilities of not only resuscitating trade and economic relations, but of developing them on a new basis.

Cooperation between regions—the heads of administrations of Krasnodar kray and Orenburg oblast have come from Russia—contacts between firms, enterprises, entrepreneurs; this is what is coming to the fore. To provide trade with fresh impetus, it has been decided to set up a joint bank and to carry out settlements in the national currencies, using dollars only for [word indistinct] beginning. This will also make it possible to clear the accumulation of mutual debts, which are making it very difficult for goods to appear on our market, and vice versa. Possibly, the signing of a treaty to encourage and protect investments, an agreement on exemption from tax on income, as well as a protocol on trade for this year will give fresh impetus to the development of economic ties.

Zhelyu Zhelev received the Russian deputy prime minister. The Bulgarian president called the meeting in Sofia a new stage in relations between the two countries.

Government Calls For Concrete Results at Mideast Talks

LD1006163693 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1607 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Text] Moscow, June 10 (TASS)—Russia expressed hope on Thursday that Arab-Israeli peaceful talks resuming in Washington on June 15 will be constructive and offered all-round support in order to reach a concrete result.

"The Russian Foreign Ministry expresses hope that the participants will show constructive mood, goodwill and will immediately begin to agree on compromise approaches to key problems of the settlement", the ministry said in a statement.

"We proceed from the necessity to put the emphasis not on what divides the parties, but on those aspects where their opinions coincide. With such an approach, we believe, it is possible to work out joint framework and other documents already during the mentioned round of negotiations", according to the statement.

The ministry added that there is a good basis for success which consists of practical decisions which "are an important and qualitative achievement" of the previous round of talks.

"Russia, as a co-sponsor of the talks is ready to render all-round support to the work aimed at a concrete result [no end quotation marks as received], "also by studying in detail the course of consideration of concrete formulas of mutually acceptable decisions", the ministry said, adding that "we intend to work in tandem with our American colleague the cooperation with who becomes ever more close and quick".

"Russia confirms its adherence to the objective of securing all-round and just peace in the Middle East on the basis of UN Resolutions 242 and 338, the principles [no end quotation marks as received] "land in exchange for peace", equal security for all, the national rights for Palestinians, as well as the implementation of the tasks of the peaceful process outlined by the Madrid conference", the statement said.

Government Sets Rules for Financial Ties With India

LD1106101593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0835 GMT 11 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow June 11 TASS—[Russian Prime Minister] Viktor Chernomyrdin signed a decision of the Russian Government on how to implement understandings reached at the Russian-Indian summit on financial and trade relations between Russia and India.

In compliance with these understandings achieved last January during Yeltsin's visit to India, the government recommends that the Russian Vneshekonombank [Foreign Trade Bank] should agree with the Indian Reserve Bank and interested Indian departments the order of reconverting India's debts in roubles into rupees as well as the order of accounting and settlements to repay debts in accordance with letters of exchange of January 28 and 29, 1993 with possible consolidation of debts of Indian departments which used credits of the former Soviet Union.

An appropriate interbank agreement is expected to be signed after an understanding is reached on this issue.

The decision says that state credits in roubles extended by the former USSR will not be used in future and their unused balance will not be converted into Indian rupees, apart from funds to be used in 1993 for fulfilling obligations to build power industry projects in India.

The decision instructs the Russian Ministry for Foreign Economic Relations to agree with the Indian side the order of settlements with respect to state credits of the former Soviet Union, used after April 1, 1992.

The document stresses that the ministry should be guided, among other things, by the need to fulfil in 1993 obligations to build power industry projects in India with a part of unused balance of state credits in roubles extended to India by the former Soviet Union.

German Minesweepers Visit St. Petersburg

LD1006173493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1655 GMT 10 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Aleksey Zavinovsky]

[Text] St. Petersburg, June 10 (TASS)—A minesweeper unit of the German naval base Olpenitz, land Schleswig-Holstein, led by Captain 2nd Rank Heinz-Joachim Shtricker and consisting of eight naval vessels, arrived on Thursday in St. Petersburg for an official visit.

At Red Navy embankment, which has lately become a sort of moorage for foreign ships, the unit was met by representatives of the Leningrad Naval Base Command and the German Naval attache in Russia, Captain 1st Rank Peter Hammer.

In an interview with TASS, Hammer said he "was glad that such meetings were becoming quite in the order of things, although in the past few years, this is perhaps the largest visit of German Naval vessels to Russia". The naval attache added he was happy to see that relations between the two navies were approaching the proper level of mutual understanding and concord.

When asked about prospects for cooperation between the German and Russian Navies, Hammer noted that "the confrontation between the East and the West had actually come to an end, and the Naval Forces would be gradually reduced. Eventually, the navies will acquire the form they should have in an ordinary state and under normal conditions, that is under no constant defence tension. Germany has already taken some steps in this direction. We no longer build submarines of certain classes and some types of guided-missile boats which were used in the Baltic Sea. This sea is becoming a sea of peace", the German Naval attache pointed out.

Norway To Carry Out Military Inspection of 6th Army

LD1006201893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1955 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Text] Moscow June 10 TASS—The press centre of the Russian Defence Ministry reported, that in keeping with the 1992 Vienna agreement on strengthening measures of confidence and security in Europe, on June 2, the Norwegian Government asked the Russian Government for permission to carry out a military inspection in the 6th Army of the Leningrad Military District, whose headquarters are situated in Petrozavodsk.

The press centre reported that the request had been satisfied and on June 10, Norwegian experts made an assessment of the information provided on the military situation in the 6th Leningrad Army.

Government Officially Applies for GATT Membership

LD1106090393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0817 GMT 11 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Gennadiy Talalayev]

[Text] Moscow June 11 TASS—Russia has officially applied on Friday [11 June] for membership in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

President Boris Yeltsin handed over to visiting GATT Director General Arthur Dunkel the official application and the necessary documents and expressed hope that GATT will adopt a decision already this year.

"Russia, while implementing reform, needs now to enter the European and world markets. And we cannot do without your organisation which has won prestige worldover", Yeltsin said, adding that Russia is ready to fulfil all commitments envisaged by the GATT Charter and procedures.

"I hope you will not bury the documents in red tape until the end of the five-year plan", Yeltsin told Dunkel using Soviet bureaucratic language.

"I hope you will adopt a decision before the end of 1993", he added.

Dunkel assured Yeltsin that the Russian application will be item number one at the GATT session next week.

Prospects for Signing Accord With EC Analyzed

MK1106100493 Moscow SEGODNYA in Russian No. 24, 11 Jun 93 (Signed to Press 10 Jun) p 2

[Vladimir Abarinov report: "Yeltsin Is Not Going to Copenhagen. Russia Does Not Want To Play With EC Moving Goal Posts"]

[Text] The internal political intrigue has moved the problem of Russia's relations with the European Community to the fringes of public attention. It was known that an economic agreement was being prepared for signing and that on 21-22 June a summit meeting of the EC Council would take place in Copenhagen, at which the heads of state, including President Yeltsin, would sign the document. The public believes that as long as the date is set, the diplomats will bend over backward to finally hammer out an agreement. It seems to the public that the West, with all its heart and soul, is for Russia's integration into world economic structures, so a mere trifle is needed—to help Russia crawl out of the morass, which is what it has actually been doing as hard as it can. How happy the West will be to see a new competitor! Meanwhile, forebodings of an affront emerged fairly long ago. The visit to Moscow by Leon Britten, deputy chairman of the European Commission, dotted the i's.

The reader is already familiar with the viewpoint of Leon Britten himself (see the previous issue of SEGODNYA). The EC representative portrays the conflict as a scholastic argument about terms: Russia allegedly claims to be a market-economy country, although it is clear even to a neophyte that, so far there is no market in Russia. The Western press is mulling over another reason: Russia argues against the linkage to human rights. No accusation can be worse than this.

A high-ranking Russian diplomat agreed to comment on the current situation. According to him, Russia thinks of itself as a country acting fully in line with international human rights standards. Hence, the clause either should be mutually applicable or should not be there at all. The main thing, however, is that this is a framework agreement. It does not regulate a specific transaction, a range of goods or services, but establishes a universal legal framework for collaboration between Russia and the EC. The problem boils down to the revocation of restrictions that are discriminatory to Russia. Our partner was unwilling to discuss this concept at the initial stage. The West prefers to grant Russia technical assistance—as a big brother would do to his younger one. Russia, however, is struggling to achieve fair access to world markets. During the talks, "our vision was accepted by the EC, which made it its negotiating stance." The delegation's mandate was enlarged correspondingly. This was a critical step demonstrating that our partners have a political will to work on the type of agreement Russia would like to have. The differences emerge out of sheer expediency. Say, the EC would like to exclude from the package of agreements metallurgy products, a range of nuclear cycle goods, and space services, that is, the sectors of the Russian economy that are the most competitive.

Right now, on the eve of the talks on joining GATT, we want our relations with the EC to be regulated by GATT rules; furthermore, they should be based on a flexible formula so that they can be adjusted as the Uruguay round makes progress. Answering my question about Moscow's attitude to the Britten's proposal for the terms and conditions of the agreement to be regularly reviewed, the diplomat said that this was a promising solution. It is fully in line with EC practice since its agreements always allow for some degree of flexibility. But unless we agree on the principles, Britten's proposal will be hanging in the air.

He concluded that the agreement would not be a unilateral one, as sometimes portrayed in the West, because Russia is also making itself part of the world market.

Work on Treaty With EC Stepped Up for Yeltsin Visit

PM1006132593 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jun 93 First Edition p 3

[Aleksey Portanskiy report: "EC and Russia Eliminate Differences To Sign Partnership Treaty"]

[Text] "It is better to have a good treaty than a hastily made one," Leon Brittan, vice president of the EC Commission, told journalists on the completion of his talks in Moscow in connection with the preparation of a treaty of partnership and cooperation between Russia and the EC.

Work on the text of the treaty has been intensified in connection with President Yeltsin's late June visit to Denmark. EC heads of state and government will be gathering in the Danish capital for a regular session of the European Council.

Russia desires the speediest signing of the treaty, since it opens up extensive opportunities for drawing our country into the world economy and is bound to have a favorable impact on the course of the Russian reforms.

In addition to the need to agree on a number of technical details, there are still differences between the sides connected with the application of norms and principles that are generally accepted in world trade and with the lifting of the existing restrictions on a number of Russian commodities (textiles, steel, nuclear cycle materials).

According to L. Brittan, agreement was reached in principle in Moscow on the important question of Russia's access to the European market for space services.

Two weeks before the meeting in Copenhagen, both sides are saying increasingly frequently that the signing of the treaty is more likely toward the end of the year, although

it cannot be entirely ruled out that it could, nonetheless, take place in the Danish capital.

Implications of East Europe-NATO Ties Eyed

PM1006104793 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Jun 93 First Edition p 4

[Aleksey Portanskiy report: "Eastern Europe: Long Route to NATO Lies Ahead"]

[Text] Late last month Hungary came up with a proposal to create the institution of associate NATO membership similar to the comparable status within the EC that six states in Central and East Europe already enjoy.

The question of associate NATO membership for Hungary and other East European states has been raised because there can as yet, for a number of reasons, be no question of new countries participating fully in the bloc. Belgian Defense Minister Leo Delcroix, who visited Moscow and St. Petersburg last week, gave these reasons, in particular.

"NATO is not closed to other countries," he told the author of this article, "I am in favor of establishing the status proposed by Hungary, but that will take a few years. The point is that Hungary's wishes are primarily political in nature, but NATO is still a military organization with its own rules, system of funding, cadre policy, etc. that have taken decades to perfect. Even now, within the framework of 15 or 16 bloc states with shared traditions and technologies it is by no means always possible to rapidly find a solution that everyone finds acceptable. Mastering NATO procedures, exchanges of visits, and cooperation in cadre training represent a necessary phase on the way to rapprochement." In the Belgian minister's opinion, the states in the "Vysehrad group" can only be admitted to NATO in and given form toward the end of the century.

Should we Russians fear the entry into NATO of our erstwhile Warsaw Pact comrades in arms? If we still think in "cold war" terms, then of course we should. NATO has, after all, become closely intertwined in our minds with the enemy image. And today we can by no means guarantee that some member of our leadership, not to mention the opposition, does not still use the former concepts.

But in actual fact we should not be afraid of Eastern Europe's rapprochement with NATO if we adhere to the realistic view that NATO existed to check communist expansion from the East and, now that the threat of this expansion has passed, this organization is changing radically: The doctrine, the main enemy, the zone of operation, and other highly important attributes of the NATO of yesteryear have disappeared.

Speaking about introducing the status of NATO associate members, Gyorgy Csoti, Hungarian delegation head at the spring session of the North Atlantic Assembly Council in Berlin and deputy chairman of the parliamentary foreign affairs commission, stressed that Russia's interests should by no means be violated. In the Hungarian parliamentarian's opinion, European security is inconceivable without Russia's participation. And his statement should not be seen as a diplomatic ruse. Because a desire to join the Western countries in a military-political bloc solely to signal a distancing from Moscow could only mean galvanizing right-wing nationalist forces in Russia, which is what East and West Europe fear most.

The gravitation toward NATO of Warsaw, Budapest, Prague, Bratislava, and also Bucharest and Tirana is linked with many European risk factors, not to mention the existence in Russia of forces prepared to revive the USSR at any cost.

Where, realistically, can small European countries obtain guarantees of their security following the disappearance of the former balance of bloc confrontation? Probably nowhere but NATO. Since, despite its profound internal problems and changes, this organization has the concrete experience and the opportunity of ensuring security for decades. It is also demonstrating its viability today, be it in operations to deliver humanitarian aid to the CIS, its readiness to implement peacekeeping actions within the CSCE framework, or in developing political cooperation with the East.

Russia 'Well Represented' at Paris Air Show

LD1006140193 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Text] Russia will be well represented at the international air show at Le Bourget, France, opening on Friday [11 June]. An official of the Aviaexport agency here, Aleksandr (Voyno), has said there will be 24 Russians flying various purpose craft at the air show near Paris. They include the latest jumbo jets, famous fighter planes among the military, Su-27 and MiG-29, and the best helicopter gunship in the world Ka-50.

Mr. (Voyno) expressed hope that the air show at Le Bourget would be a commercial success for Russia, which is a major manufacturer of aircraft in the world.

Exhibit Showcases Non-Military Aircraft

LD1006140793 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0648 GMT 10 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS special correspondents Igor Kuleshov and Nikolay Novichkov]

[Text] Paris, 10 Jun—[Passage omitted] A representative delegation from Russia, headed by First Deputy Premier Oleg Soskovets of the Russian Government, arrived in Paris on Wednesday [9 June] to take part in the Le Bourget aerospace show. The delegation includes representatives of the Russian Federation Committee for the Defense Industry, the Russian Space Agency, the Aviaprom shareholding company, and the Aviaeksport foreign trade association that groups scientific and research

institutes, experimental design centers, and serial production works in Russia, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan. Russia has brought 26 aircraft to the show, many of which are being exhibited for the first time. Russia has also brought a large batch of aviation engines, equipment, and materials, said Anatoliy Bratukhin, deputy chairman of the Russian Federation Committee for the Defense Industry at a news conference held at the Russian Embassy in France.

The exhibits convincingly reflect the conversion of the Russian aviation industry, in which the proportion of nonmilitary output has now increased to between 70-80 percent, in contrast to the previous years when production of military equipment predominated. Despite the complicated economic situation, the Russian aviation industry is one of the leading industries in the country. More than 500 aircraft of various types were produced last year. The policy of privatizing industry, being pursued by the Russian Government, opens up opportunities for broader cooperation, he noted. The Russian aviation industry can become a reliable business partner in the context of designing new planes and helicopters, putting them into serial production, and expanding exports. The task of ensuring production of civilian planes and helicopters up to modern standards that the Russian aviation industry is facing will be facilitated by the setting up of joint enterprises with the involvement of foreign firms. This is confirmed by the passenger planes TU-204 with English Rolls-Royce engines and the IL-96-300 with U.S. Pratt-Whitney engines that are exhibited at the show. As for the Space exposition, said Aleksandr Medvedchikov, representing the Russian Space Agency, even though not everything Russia currently has in the space field is included, nonetheless the most important and interesting exhibits are being shown. [passage omitted]

Academician Yuriy Ryzhov, Russian ambassador to France, who addressed the news conference, replying to journalists' questions emphasized that many in the West, endeavoring to restrict Russia's access to world aviation and Space markets, resort to methods that are far from civilized. Attempts are also undertaken to cast aspersions on Russian military equipment, the MIG-29 fighter, for example. However, the Luftwaffe [German air force] pilots, who received 24 MIG-29 aircraft following German unification, praised their unique potential.

Constitutional Conference

Plenary Session Meets 10 Jun Under Yeltsin

LD1006130493 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1200 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Text] A plenary session of the Constitutional Conference is opening in Moscow right now. It has to sum up the first results of the work in the groups and to analyze some issues of a conceptual nature that arose during the work of experts. Speeches by all the coordinators of the groups are expected. Boris Yeltsin will chair the session.

Yeltsin Addresses Session

LD1006200493 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1745 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Address by President Boris Yeltsin at the 10 June session of the Constitutional Conference in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed participants in the Constitutional Conference. As we agreed on the first day, today a woking plenary session is being held. the first three days of work have shown that such a proposal was correct. It is necessary, as they say, to check our watches. The main work is taking place in groups, and a number of organizational and interesting questions and proposals have already appeared which we could discuss today.

During the discussions, ideas of a major state scale arise which deserve to be known not only to the groups but all participants of the Constitutional Conference. This concerns proposals, first and foremost, on three topics. First, the mechanism to adopt the constitution—it is necessary to compare various approaches and then choose and recommend the optimal method of adoption: who will adopt it, in accordance with what procedures, since such produces are not provided for by the constitution, and so on and so forth.

Second, elections for Russia's supreme legislative body: what mechanism will there be for the elections; are we going to introduce party lists, and the fact that a number of sections have named a date for holding them in October this year.

Third, initially it was proposed that the completed draft constitution would be presented to the subjects of the Federation for initialing. But there arises the natural desire to express their attitude toward the draft to other participants in the conference, and an acceptable formula can then be worked out.

During the conference's work a further problem has arisen. Disagreements are already being formed and working commissions are not up to resolving them. That is, groups are making different decisions on one and the same articles. Among them are questions of equality among subjects of the Federation, on private property, on citizenship, and evidently a further series of questions will arise for which it will be necessary to seek, not so much a political compromise as a legal solution—if one can put it that way, a legal compromise.

It was precisely because of this that it was proposed to use, within the framework of our conference, in cases of particular necessity, a mechanism of constitutional arbitration, inviting conference participants from the supreme judiciary for this purpose—from the Constitutional Court, the Supreme Court, the Supreme Arbitration Court, and also several major legal scholars. In those rare instances when a problem is particularly difficult and the argument cannot be fully worked out, with the help of constitutional arbitration a final verdict will be isued, sanctioned by the highest authority of professionals. I consider thus the respect for the law and judicial authority will be shown, and the representatives who were elected in the sections will be included additionally in the composition of the working commission.

The first days of our work have shown that we have not been wrong about the actual idea of the Conference. Since the referendum the desire has emerged and gathered strength that we want to seek agreement and compromise. This has been expressed ever more clearly by representatives of various political movements, parties, and organizations. The search for agreement has been one of the main themes of the regional conference held in May. A turn toward cooperation is also noticeable among the Russian deputies and some of the leadership of the Supreme Soviet.

Our conference also confirms that the line toward confrontation and tough opposition is losing its adherents. Far more attractive today is working constructively together at one table. And in the groups now, even those who in other circumstances might have found themselves on different sides of the barricades, are finding common ground. I regret that the first day of our work was not without an incident. The immunity of Deputy Slobodkin came in to conflict with that of the present. [applause] At the same time, it gives me satisfaction that Yuriy Maksimovich is now interested in working on the draft constitution in one of the groups. I am glad, too, that many of those who walked out on the first day are also taking part in the work of the Constitutional Conference.

The most valuable thing we have achieved in these past days has been to have established a normal productive process of further work on the draft constitution. It is to the credit of those attending the conference that they have not thrown themselves into fruitless political battles. Within the groups I have seen for myself that Russia does have the potential for political and parliamentary culture. People of different convictions, different political positions, and so on, are capable of conducting productive discussions and working professionally and effectively.

All this convinces me that Russia not only needs a strong professional parliament, but that it will have one. The preparation of the draft constitution, which is now in

progress, proves increasingly that the predominant mood is not the defense of the ambitions of the authors of one or other of the draft, but rather the desire to draw up a document of real quality. In effect, there are two well-known drafts being worked on—being worked on, and not in competition. That can only help us to achieve our purpose.

I would like to deal particularly with an issue over which—in my view, artificially—passions are being whipped up. This is the question of whether or not democracy and the soviets are compatible, something that I spoke about in my report. Like any other conference participant, first I was entitled to express this thesis, and I did so—all the more since both here and outside our forum there are more than a few adherents to that position, although of course it also has its opponents.

Today this is, as one says, a theme for discussion: let both sides state their arguments and seek the truth. However, we cannot allow polemics on an important legal and constitutional issue to adopt the language of ultimata or be illegitimately replaced by political pressure. At the same time, I am not in favor of any sort of revolutionary action vis-a-vis the soviets, and I paid special attention to this in my report. The main thing that I had in mind was that the soviets, as an instrument of the former structures of the CPSU, like a unified corporation, in accordance with the plans of those who created it, combined and still combine in their activity legislative enactment, monitoring, and executive and management functions. This is precisely the source of their constant striving to substitute for the executive bodies of power, and this is precisely the reason for their non-acceptance of the principle of the division of powers. In those places where the soviets have overcome the syndrome of being all powerful, they are beginning to perform productive and effective work in cooperation with the executive and judicial powers.

That is why the representative bodies of power need to be reformed deeply, gradually, stage by stage. I shall stress once again: I am in favor of strong representative power—at the federal level with a professional parliament, and at the level of the regions, and no one should have any doubts about this.

I would like in particular to speak about the deputies. Many of them share the same view on the policy of reforms and actively implement it. As I have already said, there are soviets at various levels which occupy similar positions. I believe that this is an additional argument in favor of saying that the process of the development of soviet power into parliamentary representative power will proceed smoothly, without sharp jumps or disruptions.

On the whole I am satisfied with the way the conference is going. The work in groups is making progress. At the same time, some of them may perhaps not be able to complete their planned work in time, that is by 16 June. The proposal has been made that if this happens the timetable for that group or those groups should be extended a little, say by one or two days. At the same time, they can take their place in preparing the final document so that it can be signed by everyone together.

In general, the plenary session does have some questions to discuss. Let us begin our work.

Proposals have been made about the schedule for today's session. It was proposed that first of all the floor should be given to Ruslan Imranovich Khasbulatov. However, I have received a report that he has become ill.

Shumeyko Addresses Session

LD1106002393 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1745 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Remarks by Vladimir Shumeyko, first deputy chairman of Council of Ministers, at the 10 June session of Constitutional Conference in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] The position at present is that our group has considered in full three chapters of the draft constitution or 69 articles. The group's work is proceeding harmoniously in a comradely and creative atmosphere. Everyone is concerned about one thing alone—preparing the draft constitution as quickly as possible and seeing that its quality is as good as possible.

I would say that this unanimity in the group is linked with the fact that in examining the draft constitution and in adopting or rejecting various amendments the group is guided by several principles that it regards, I would say, as unshakable, namely the principles of building the constitution as such.

I will now specify the main principles. The first principle by which we are guided in our work is authority. The authority of the Russian Federation must be strong and able to function. Various forms of authority are permissible besides that of the soviets. Our group considers that in present day conditions the best form of authority is presidential authority, where the president is head of state and where there is a clear-cut principle of division of authority into parliamentary, executive, and judicial authorities.

The second principle that we advocate is federalism. The first aspect of this is the mandatory constitutional enshrinement of the equality of the Federation's subjects. This means first and foremost equality of all citizens of the Russian Federation, because unless equality of the subjects is enshrined there will be no equality for citizens residing in the various subject territories with various rights. The second aspect in federalism is the priority of federal law over the subjects' laws. Third, the Russian Federation is a federative state, but unified and indivisible. And last, federalism cannot be fixed by treaty, so the Federal Treaty should not be part of the constitution, but on the contrary, all the clauses and rights achieved in it must be constitutionally reinforced. There must be the law of the constitution.

The third principle which our group is guided by is economic freedom. The constitution and all its clauses must not obstruct the development of the economy. The constitution must reinforce the system of free enterprise and the unimpeded circulation of information, goods, and capital throughout the Russian Federation's territory.

Finally, the fourth principle, the constitution must contain practical, implementable clauses. There must not be any declarations there.

Calls For Equality of Citizens

LD1006200093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1932 GMT 10 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Lyudmila Yermakova]

[Text] Moscow June 10 TASS—The equality of the subjects of the federation is primarily connected with the equality of its citizens, first vice premier of the Russian Government, Vladimir Shumeyko, said on Thursday [10 June]. "If some article of the constitution says that citizens are equal, while according to another article of the same constitution, subjects of the federation are not equal," there will be no equality between citizens, Shumeyko said, adding that the constitution exists for the sake of man.

In his opinion, in order to fully resolve this problem, powers of all subjects of the federation should be levelled in political, economic and legislative spheres, but the republics should reserve the rights to attributes of power—its president, parliament, flag, anthem and state emblem, Shumeyko said, expressing the hope that this problem can be resolved.

"The Constitutional Conference stands a good chance of resolving one of the most difficult problems—the problem of the subjects of the federation," said Gennadiy Burbulis, president of the International Humanitarian Centre for Political Studies, "strategy of the 21st century." He emphasised that the structure of the Constitutional Conference is the unique political finding enabling representatives of republics to see Russia in its multiple forms and not to stick to the slogan "We Are Republics And We Need All." During the conference regions and districts can see their important place in Russia's common space," Burbulis said.

Chernomyrdin Addresses Session

LD1006214593 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1758 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Remarks by Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin at the 10 June session of the Constitutional Conference in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] One has to say that discussion and adoption of the amendments is proceeding rather slowly. The truth emerges after deep and detailed discussions. Perhaps, this is how it should be. After all, a fundamentally new document is being born—the basic law of the new Russia. To date, 65 articles have already been discussed and over 600 amendments to the text were adopted. In connection with this, I would like to mention one suggestion submitted to the first article of the first statute on putting a ban on all kinds of incitement to violence, and on preaching nationalism, chauvinism, and propaganda of war.

Another fundamentally important suggestion, in our opinion, was to include in the constitution a separate article which would state that the subjects of the Russian Federation have equal rights and obligations determined by this constitution. In our opinion, it is also necessary to introduce an article saying that people can exercise their power directly as well as through representatives. In other words, both these channels for implementing people's power should be established by the constitution.

Further Chernomyrdin Comment

LD1006162593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1433 GMT 10 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Gennadiy Talalayev]

[Text] Moscow June 10 TASS—Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin, who is chairing the group of federal bodies of authority at the Constitutional Assembly, said there are not "the slightest hints of confrontation" in the work, but complained that the adoption of decisions takes too much time.

However, he told the Constitutional Assembly on Thursday [10 June] that the objective truth is arrived at as a result of deep and detailed discussions.

Fears that the Constitutional Assembly may not end as planned have been voiced also by President Boris Yeltsin, who said one or two days may be given to those groups which are out of schedule.

The press service of the assembly said on Thursday that the forum will work even on Sunday to speed up the discussion.

Chernomyrdin called on the conference to support the rules of submitting to parliament lawbills on budget, taxes, state expenses and loans fixed in the presidential draft constitution and granting the right exclusively to the president and the federal government.

"Otherwise we shall forever fix in legislation the annual repetition of the situation which existed last and early this year when political ambitions put on the ailing budget trillions of additional expenses", the prime minister said.

He also said the constitution should give the federal government the right to influence the implementation of its decisions throughout the country.

Shakhray Addresses Session

LD1006222393 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1745 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Remarks by Deputy Prime Minister Sergey Shakhray at the 10 June session of Constitutional Conference in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] [Yeltsin] On behalf of the group of representatives of the bodies of state power within the Russian Federation—from krays, oblasts, autonomous oblasts, autonomous regions, and the cities of Moscow and St. Petersburg, its coordinator Sergey Mikhailovich Shakhray will now take floor.

[Shakhray] What views and proposals are there on the further work of the Constitutional Conference? I have two proposals of this kind. First: not to disrupt the work of the Constitutional Conference with the premature appearance of intermediate or reserve drafts and to turn to variants of this kind only after examining the basic provisions of the constitutional drafts.

The second proposal: Members of our group are coming forward with requests not to disband the Constitutional Conference on 16 June, but to declare a break in its work, and having created a conciliatory commission, for example, or a coordinating commission, to keep working, and after a month, or as long as need dictates, to assemble the full Constitutional Conference. The Constitutional Conference should be preserved as a consultative body. In essence, it is a roundtable of all the main political forces in the country.

Ryabov Addresses Session

LD1006210793 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1755 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Report by unidentified correspondent on the 10 June session of Russian Constitutional Conference in Moscow, including recorded portions of address at conference by Nikolay Ryabov, deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet]

[Text] [Ryabov] Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich, esteemed colleagues. The four days of work of the Constitutional Conference, especially the work in the groups of representatives, have completely overturned the theory on mutual opposition, on the incompatibility of the draft constitutions of the president and the Constitutional Conference, and therefore on the impossibility of working out a single text. On the contrary, the conclusions of specialists and politicians confirm the considerable similiarity of the contents of the majority of their articles. The work in groups has shown not only this, but also the real possibility of incorporating a number of norms, even whole institutions, for example the guarantee of human rights and freedoms, from one text into the other draft. So it has been fairly clearly shown that the articles on the legal status of the individual and the catalogue of rights and freedoms in both drafts are to a considerable degree identical, and the formulations of the articles are close or simply coincide.

In this section of the draft presented by the president there are clauses which are absent in the corresponding draft of the Constitutional Commission—I will not list them. On the other hand, many participants in the Constitutional Conference are attracted by the logic of the construction of the section and its complete detail in the Constitutional Commission's draft.

[Correspondent] Having assessed the proposed draft constitutions, the speaker focused his attention on three basic models for a state system.

[Ryabov] The construction of a federation as a union state—well, you are familiar with the draft proposed by the Kalmyk Republic, in which Russia is composed of 22 subjects of the Federation, one of which is formed by Russia's krays and oblasts. It is supported to one degree or another by some of the republics. The second construction is of a federation as an association of economic and political subjects of the Federation, with full equal rights, like the FRG laender. In this version the full equality of subjects of the Federation is proposed, regardless of their formal status at the present time. It is supported by a considerably larger number of representatives of krays and oblasts. The third model is the construction of the Federation preserving the present situation where subjects of the Federation have various rights. This model is clearly not supported by the majority of the participants in the conference.

Sobchak Addresses Session

LD1106083793 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1800 GMT 10 June 93

[Remarks by St. Petersburg Mayor Anatoliy Sobchak at the 10 June session of the Constitutional Conference in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] I would like to draw the first conclusions of our work to your attention. The first and perhaps most important result of these days has been to show that, despite an extremely wide spectrum of opinions, we can all agree and work without turning it into a rally, and work constructively and positively, if we are really talking about real work.

I would like to draw attention to those points which transgress the boundaries of the concept of the constitution itself, both the presidential draft and the draft proposed by the parliamentary commission. Let us say, a decision was adopted practically unanimously that the president must be the holder of executive power. This contradicts the very concept of the presidential draft very seriously, and so I foresee many complications when we get to determining—when we get to the articles where relations between president and parliament and government are determined, because here we have a

completely different correlation of president, government, and parliament, in order to create an equilibrium between the relevant structures.

Moscow Mayor Addresses Session

LD1106092293 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1805 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Remarks by Moscow Mayor Yuriy Luzhkov at the 10 June session of the Constitutional Conference in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] [Yeltsin] Yuriy Mikhailovich Luzhkov, mayor of Moscow, will speak.

[Luzhkov] First, why do we need a new constitution? Why can the state otherwise not only not develop but not exist under the conditions of the current Constitution? First of all, we consider, because the country has a clear duality of power. In the best case, this is dualism: in fact, it is a multiplicity of power, with a multiplicity of intermingled structures of authority weighing down on individual citizens. Each of these structures is moving in its own direction. This is anarchy, which is impermissible in a stable society, and all the less permissible at a time of deep change in the economy and the structure of society. We need a constitution that will clearly and concisely determine the rights and powers and responsibilities of all embodiments of state power.

Second, what sort of state structure does Russia need? In what way can we guide an economy which is regulated by the state to a significant extent today, and will be for several years to come? This cannot be done by a weak executive authority, wholly dependent on accident and the procrastinations of parliamentary discussions and procedures. This cannot be done by weak executive power, when the bounds of its authority are not laid down, and when its decisions do not travel along a precise chain of command, subject along the way to change and, in the best case, being ignored.

So, we need strong, independent executive authority, whose responsibilities and powers are clearly defined. The choice of a type of state power is not a subject for political games or playful decisions by one leader or another. It is dictated by the demands of an economy which is restructuring itself, by the traditions of the social structure of Russia, by the realistic and weighty interests of subjects of the Russian state. So, we need a constitution of strong executive power, a constitution under which the generally elected president is the head of the state and a guarantee of its sovereignty and stability.

Third, what is our knowledge of the functions of state power? In August 1991 we did not stand up for democracy in order that a new dictatorship should arrive, but in order that our state could develop in democratic conditions, and, it follows, in conditions where parliament has full legal power with all rights, but with responsibility. The whole system of representative bodies, also. We support the idea put forward by the president that a system born of a totalitarian state without responsible soviets, pretending to omnipotence, is not and will never be a democratic system for organizing representative bodies. Essentially, the soviets are today gradually transforming themselves into a sort of political and hierarchical structure with its own strict discipline, its own conference calls, which happened again today, punishments, expulsions of those who do not share their views, and defense of their allies from the law.

Therefore we support the idea of a professional and competent parliament with a clear-cut division of functions between chambers, and free from any presidium-like superstructures.

Yakovlev Addresses Session

LD1106100293 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1809 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Remarks by Aleksandr Yakovlev, head of sector at the State and Law Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences at the 10 June session of the Constitutional Conference in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] [Yeltsin] Next to speak is Aleksandr Maksimovich Yakovlev, group coordinator, head of sector at the State and Law Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

[Yakovlev] I am really surprised that no one has ever started wondering about this rather peculiar institution—I refer to joint or mixed competence. I have tried to trace its history, to find out who invented it. Well, it was invented in the Soviet Union, in the law on distribution of powers. You might remember this union law on delimitation of powers between union republics and the USSR. Here we have a precise reproduction of the same idea. Let us have a closer look at what this joint competence is meant to be. It is when decisions are reached jointly. All right. Can decisions be reached jointly? Certainly they can. But when, under what conditions? It is only when we are equal. We are equal, we sit together, discuss things, and come to some joint decisions. What is proposed here, however, is joint competence of a central and a local body. Joint indeed. Mind you, under these conditions we still have the norm stipulating that federal laws override local ones. So by the law of probabilities, in half the cases we shall come to an agreement, which is fine—but in the other 50 percent of the cases we will differ. One participant of this joint process will be for something, the other, against it. The one who is at the top will just issue a law—and so where does our joint competence take us? So I call on all of us to think together, since we are to incorporate all the useful points.

One last thing. I am thinking about the future of the Federation Treaty in the context of the Constitution, and especially this mysterious...[pauses] Well, we do know that it is not really mysterious. Everything mysterious becomes quite clear here, as you yourselves realize, such things as what this joint competence serves, and how it

works in practice. Well then. The strength of a federal state consisting of powerful autonomous parts [subyekty], and yet with strong autonomous [as heard] power, lies in a clear-cut delimitation of powers between the center and the provinces. I am going to express my personal view, which might well be seditious: I am fundamentally opposed to the whole institution of joint competence. I believe that the exclusive competence of the center should be defined clearly. Do not let anyone interfere with any of that joint stuff. The competence of constituent parts [subyekty] should also be defined clearly, and the center must not be allowed to interfere. There may be cases when the two things overlap due to the complexity of life in general, but for those purposes we have the Constitutional Court to deal with individual cases.

Well, I can see people winking at me now. So one last thing. Just to complete this with one last appeal. Whatever our deliberations on the ways to adopt the new constitution, I say this: We must not lose that important new element in the legitimacy of the president, which he found as a result of the referendum. This cannot be left out of our overall analysis of the paths we have to follow in adopting the new constitution.

Rumyantsev Addresses Session

LD1106100093 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1812 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Remarks by Oleg Germanovich Rumyantsev, secretary of the Constitutional Commission, at the 10 June session of the Constitutional Conference in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] [Yeltsin] Next to speak is Oleg Germanovich Rumyantsev, secretary of the Constitutional Commission.

[Rumyantsev] There are different ways of looking at what happened here on 5 June. It is obvious today, however, that some kind of warning was made—maybe in too harsh a form—about the inadmissibility of discussing and working on just one draft. I think this warning was noted by most of the participants in the Constitutional Conference. Two hours of work we have done today, giving preliminary assessment to the work in sections, have shown that the political philosophy of this whole meeting seems to be changing—from fighting your opponents to cooperating. It is no coincidence that many of today's speakers said that the draft presented by the Constitutional Commission was being looked into in detail at various sections.

Here is what I should like to say in this context. With a very controversial Supreme Soviet and with a very controversial Consitutional Commission we have after all accepted the fact that the Constitutional Conference is a reality one cannot overlook. This is very important. In the end, on 4 May the Supreme Soviet did adopt a resolution—and we had to fight for this resolution. In it we said that in further work on an agreed version of the constitution, the proposals of the Constitutional Conference ought to be taken into account. It is after all very important that the legislative assembly should mention in its resolution the Constitutional Conference set up by a presidential decree. It is also very important that on the same day, on 4 May, the Constitutional Commission decided to participate in the conference in order to agree on the principles.

Official Remarks Summarized

LD1006172893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1655 GMT 10 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Lyudmila Aleksandrova, Tamara Zamyatina]

[Text] Moscow June 10 TASS—The first days of the work of the Constitutional Conference showed that in the course of debates "ideas have been expressed on a nationwide scale," said Russian President Boris Yeltsin, opening a second plenary meeting of the Constitutional Conference in the Kremlin on Thursday [10 June].

The president pointed out that he comes out for a strong representative power—a professional parliament at the federal and the regional level.

Nikolay Ryabov, deputy chairman of the Russian Parliament, said that a problem of the federal state system is one of the most difficult subjects for reaching consensus.

Vice-premier of the Russian Government, Sergey Shakhray, called not to dissolve the Constitutional Conference on June 16, but announce a break and continue work after setting up a conciliatory commission. Shakhray believes that the Constitutional Conference should be preserved as a deliberative body. "In fact, this is a 'round table' meeting between all main political forces of our country, which have proved their viability," he said.

St. Petersburg Mayor Anatoliy Sobschak, a coordinator of the sector of parties and public movements, said that all members of the section had unanimously rejected a postulate defining Councils of People's Deputies as a political basis of the state.

"There is no shadow of confrontation either between political forces, or between the two drafts of the constitution in the work of a group of federal bodies of power," said chairman of the group, Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin. The group recommended that a number of principally important provisions from the parliamentary draft of the constitution be included in the final text of the constitution.

In conclusion, Yeltsin noted that today's plenary session was "interesting and rich in content". He suggested that two more groups be set up to discuss a draft of the election law and the procedure of the adoption of the constitution. As for a break in the conference, Yeltsin suggested that this should be decided nearer to June 17, depending on the results of the work carried out by the groups of the Constitutional Conference.

Yeltsin Interviewed After Session

LD1006214093 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2000 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] After the plenary session of the Constitutional Conference, President Yeltsin met journalists.

[Begin Yeltsin recording] We are trying hard not to drag this out, because this duality of power and anarchy are very harmful to us. Unfortunately, Ruslan Imranovich Khasbulatov has fallen ill and was not there. His deputy spoke, as well as all the coordinators of all the groups, reporting on how the work is going. They all said that the work is continuing in an agreed fashion, despite the differences in views of parties, movements, and social groups.

All the same, agreement is being found, and work is moving forward in all the groups. The plenary session will be conclusive, but it may not complete the work of the Constitutional Conference. An interesting proposal was made today, and I supported it in the end. Let us say we put through some kind of unified draft at the concluding plenary session so that we have it; then later we can declare a break in the work of the Constitutional Conference, as the whole form and style of its work in groups and so on has demonstrated a very high efficiency as a Constitutional Conference and a very respectful attitude toward each other by completely different tendencies of social groups. This is very very important.

I support elections no later that October this year. I have already said in conclusion that the two intersectional groups [mezh-sektsionyye gruppy]—which will be working on two very global issues, the issue of elections and the issue of the means of adoption of the constitution... [pauses] We are inviting representatives of the Constitutional Commission into these two intersectional groups. [end recording]

Rumyantsev Interviewed on Drafts

LD1006221093 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2000 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Text] Our correspondent Georgiy Sovtsov interviewed Oleg Rumyantsev, one of the developers of the parliamentary constitution draft. Speaking at the second plenary session, he proposed the organization of a joint working group to complete work on the two constitution drafts.

[Begin recording] [Rumyantsev] The most important thing in my view is to give up the terms victory and defeat. The constitutional conference has taken a great step forward in recognizing the draft by the constitutional commission as a reality, and I think that the president has today accepted the idea that the draft prepared here and the other version of an agreed draft which is gestating in the bowels of the Constitutional Commission must be brought together as a working action by specialists, deputies, politicians—a small number or group of, I suppose, ten people from each side—during the period of June to July for the November conference and general discussion by the populace.

[Sovtsov] There was a third draft constitution, however, from the communists.

[Rumyantsev] I want to say that there will be very great pressure from the communist draft here to increase social guarantees, and this is well-founded pressure: The government must be social, but it must not be utopially social [as heard]. This is why a joint working group must pay great attention to the opposition draft as well. The main thing is for cooperation not to fail, because it is also very difficult for us in the Supreme Soviet to push through the idea of, for example, cooperation. Parliament, however, will refuse to cooperate once again, because it will ignore it as before. It is erroneous to ignore it, however, because you cannot exclude it from the procedure of adopting a constitution, and adopting a law on elections.

Further on 9 Jun Conference Proceedings

Shumeyko: 80% Want Single Draft

PM1006154193 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 9 Jun 93 p 1

[Unattributed report under "Executive Power: Monitoring" rubric: "Meetings, Conversations, Working Visits"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] At the Constitutional Conference First Vice Premier Vladimir Shumeyko heads one of the five groups, which is discussing the president's draft constitution. Addressing journalists, the first vice premier stressed that 80 percent of participants in the Constitutional Conference are in favor of elaborating a single draft. However, he noted, if the Congress [of People's Deputies] is unable to adopt the constitution as a whole, without any protracted discussion, the president can propose that the Congress declare a referendum on the adoption of the constitution. If the Congress does not accede to this, it is possible that early elections will be declared for a deputies' corps which must adopt the constitution.

Groups' Work Reported

PM1106093593 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 10 Jun 93 p 2

[Unattributed roundup under the rubric "Constitutional Conference: Day Four": "Chronicle"]

[Text] **Group 1. Representatives of Russian Federation Federal Organs of Power**

Addenda to Articles 17 and 18 were made during the morning sitting. There was a lengthy discussion on the question of whether or not to add provisions of Articles

62,63, 65, and 66 of the Constitutional Commission's draft to Article 18. In the end, Chita Oblast's amendment was adopted.

An amendment to Article 21 proposing to exclude the right of private ownership of land was rejected.

In the afternoon it was deemed expedient to include a number of parts of separate articles in the Constitutional Commission draft (including Chapter 5, "Guarantee of Rights and Freedoms," in its entirety) in the draft being discussed.

Group 2. Representatives of Organs of State Power of Republics Within the Russian Federation, Krays, Oblasts, the Autonomous Oblast, Autonomous Okrugs, and the Cities of Moscow and St. Petersburg.

In the course of the day, Articles 19-35 were examined and amendments to them were adopted.

The sittings on the second day of work were conducted in a businesslike, constructive, and amicable atmosphere, promoted to a great extent by Chairmen S.M. Shakhray and A.S. Tyazhlov.

Group 3. Representatives of Local Government.

At the proposal of Yu.F. Yarov, agreement was reached in the morning that representatives should be delegated to other groups when they discuss the section relating to local self-government.

The discussion on amendments to the draft Constitution continued for a fairly long time, and decisions were adopted by an overwhelming majority of votes.

In particular an amendment to Article 71 was adopted—"To word Part One as follows: "The Russian Federation President is elected by **nationwide ballot** for five years."

By the end of the day, the section had discussed four chapters. Everyone was offered transcripts of the work done yesterday by all of the sections.

Group 4. Representatives of Political Parties, Trade Union, Youth, and Other Social Organizations, Mass Movements, and Religions

V.V. Zhirinovskiy, leader of the Liberal Democratic Party of Russia [LDP], brought and distributed in the upper rows of the hall an edition of the PRAVDA ZHIRINOVSKOGO newspaper.

A draft of the Constitution prepared by the LDP and the Statement and draft of the Declaration on the Constitution, prepared by the Economic Freedom Party, were also distributed in the hall.

The central question of the morning debate was the discussion of an amendment to Article 5 to the effect that the president is the head of the executive.

Group 5. Representatives of Commodity Producers and Entrepreneurs

The work of the section proceeded at a good pace and productively. A total of 55 amendments to 27 articles were examined.

The greatest interest and the most heated debate was generated by amendments on military service and on the possibility of receiving free higher education, and the article on taxation. At the end of the morning sitting, a stormy discussion flared up about the approach to the Constitution in general.

Further on 8 Jun Conference Proceedings

Shakhray Addresses Group

PM1106114793 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 10 Jun 93 p 2

["We Must Unite All the Best Things. Extracts From Sergey Shakhray's Speech at the Sitting of the Group of Representative Organs of State Power of Republics Within the Russian Federation, Krays, Oblasts, the Autonomous Oblast, Autonomous Okrugs, and the Cities of Moscow and St. Petersburg 8 June"]

[Text] We have chosen an approach which enables us to unite all the best things in the drafts of the Constitution and essentially create a new document, and thus slowly but surely move forward toward the elaboration of a single text of the draft Russian Federation Constitution.

A conference of the working group for the preparation of the Constitution was held, in which all coordinators of all five of our working groups participated. We exchanged information and informed the participants in the working commission of the adopted decisions, in particular on the recommendation to conduct another plenary sitting. It will be held on or around Thursday. This will be a general discussion. At the same time, the coordinators of the working groups were given the task of reporting on the first results of the methods of work in order to be able to sum up the results of the working groups in general terms.

It can be said that all the groups have moved ahead in the text, and there are even those who have gone through more than 20 articles.

We decided to form a separate chapter entitled "The Principles of the Constitutional System," in which the first seven articles of the Presidential Draft and the first 12 articles of the Constitutional Commission's draft will be united. I hope that the experts will carry out our instructions.

Virtually all groups are comparing drafts and only some are operating in a tougher manner, rejecting and adopting amendments. In view of the compromise, and in view of the flexibility, I think that we will obtain a

result. And because the coordinators have exchanged opinions, a rapprochement of positions and methods of work has occurred.

I make the following proposal: To instruct experts to draw up new wording on the basis of Articles 24 and 13, because editorial errors are in evidence, but nothing can be discarded per se, because there are substantial factors involved. The essence of the content of Articles 24 and 13 must be unified and new wording must be proposed for this article. The only thing I would ask is that a decision of principle to the effect that individual excisions may be effected by federal constitutional law be ratified, and that a list of articles to which this principle may or may not relate be provided, like in the presidential version, so that the experts have a clear task facing them.

Now something about Article 123. Having worked in a state of emergency area, I became convinced of one thing, namely that it is practically impossible to implement a state of emergency in our country: That's one thing. Second, it is practically impossible to implement incomplete legislation on a state of emergency. It is so incomplete that to my mind, parliament will have to elaborate a new law on the state of emergency. The incomplete state of legislation on the state of emergency can be interpreted in different ways. I do not consider a republic's accord to be absolute in the implementation of a state of emergency. What if the republic's organs of power are paralyzed? What if events there develop in such a way that it is impossible to assemble a session of the republic's Supreme Soviet? This means that no one can ever protect the law and citizens' rights there. We have had such deadlock situations.

I believe that experts must be entrusted with this article. But we have to make sure that the experts make a framework construction for the Constitution, and that parliament adopts a detailed law on the conditions of the Federation Treaty. The actual text of this law must be coordinated with the components of the Russian Federation before it is ratified in parliament.

I also propose that the wording of the article proposed by the Council of Judges be taken as the basis, and it should be handed over to experts so that they can carry out further work on the text and present it to us in written form. There are a great many subtleties here, and every word is worth a very great deal. The proposal is as follows: To extract the wording concerning the death penalty from this article and formulate it in a separate article. Such proposals have been made. I will put this proposal to the vote. Who is in favor of the wording concerning the death penalty being moved into a separate article? Edit them in a single article, but in the form of a separate part [Redaktiruyte v odnoy statye, no v vide otdelnoy chasti].

Working Groups' Progress Reported

PM1106103793 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 10 Jun 93 First Edition p 2

[Andrey Sharapov article: "Sobchak and Borovoy Bestow Monarch's Rights Before Monarchy Is Introduced"]

[Text] The sections of the Constitutional Conference continued their work 8 June discussing the draft Fundamental Law.

The group of representatives of federal organs of power discussed in particular the question of adding the provisions of a number of articles in the Constitutional Commission's version to Article 18 of the president's draft. Article 23 of the [Constitutional Commission's] legitimate draft was adopted in full and the amendment to Article 20 submitted by V. Radchenko, acting chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Court, was adopted.

Members of the group representing organs of state power in Russia's republics, krays, oblasts, autonomous oblast, autonomous okrugs, and Moscow and St. Petersburg also agreed that they would use the Constitutional Commission's draft in their work. Murat Keligov, a member of the group and the Ingush Republic's representative, said that, in the event of disagreements over the provisions of the president's draft, experts had been instructed to articulate the suggestions made, take the Constitutional Commission's draft into consideration, and submit summarized wordings the next day.

We would remind you that two volumes of amendments have been submitted to the participants in the working groups. There are over 700 of these amendments, but it is planned to have completely finished discussing them by 12 June.

The group of representatives of local self-government entities coordinated by Yarov and Zolotukhin agreed to organize its work rationally and study the table of amendments in its spare time away from sessions, noting its opinion alongside each amendment with the words "yes" or "no." The members of the sections also considered it necessary to send their representatives to other groups when the section on local self-government was being discussed.

Vice Premier Yuriy Yarov admitted to journalists that the absence at the conference of those who walked out 5 June is an "unnecessary complication" and pleases no one. Various options are being studied to ensure that participation in the Constitutional Conference is as full as possible.

The group of representatives of commodity producers and entrepreneurs (47 participants have registered there) continued discussing the series of amendments on freedom of conscience, speech, and information, privacy of correspondence, protection of private and intellectual property, and racial and ethnic equality.

Just over 100 of the 176 people who registered took part in the section of representatives of political parties, trade union, youth, and republic organizations, mass movements, and religious faiths. Standing orders say that an amendment is to be considered if over five people vote in favor of it; three minutes are allocated for substantiating the amendment, and one minute for answering questions.

The main stumbling block during the day's debate was the discussion of an amendment to Article 5, which says that the president is the head of the executive power. Group Coordinator A. Sobchak voiced the view that, in the absence of a developed multiparty system and normal relations between the branches of power, "by making the president the head of the executive power, we are making him a monarch."

Some 66 participants in the section represent members of the public committee of Russia's democratic organizations (which was organized this January and comprises 92 sociopolitical organizations). Vladimir Filin, this committee's coordinator and chairman of the Social Liberal Party, said that the participants in this section will insist that the committee is represented by three men on the Constitutional Conference's working commission. Otherwise, Vladimir Filin stressed, we are not guaranteed against subjectivism during the phase of the conference's work when the working commission summarizes the amendments submitted by all five groups.

St. Petersburg Mayor Anatoliy Sobchak, who is at the same time one of the authors of the new presidential draft and the coordinator of the "party" section, answered journalists' questions at the Constitutional Conference Press Center. He expressed regret, in particular, that the president had not dissolved parliament after the referendum and scheduled new deputies' elections. If the process of adopting a new constitution comes to a standstill Sobchak does not rule out the possibility of a constitutional law's being adopted specifying that parliamentary reelections be held without fail. Nor, however, did he rule out the possibility of the Congress' adopting the Constitution.

Sergey Shakhray, coordinator of the section of representatives of organs of power from the components of the Federation, gave a press conference at the Foreign Ministry Press Center on Zubovskiy Boulevard where he vehemently emphasized the merits of the new presidential draft constitution.

The Economic Freedom Party, in the shape of its invariably smiling leader Konstantin Borovoy, caused a slightly bizarre sensation at the Constitutional Conference. A statement circulated by the party asked conference participants to simply adopt the constitution after examining and approving it and to sign a Declaration on the Constitution based on the Declaration of Independence adopted by representatives of the American states in June 1776.

In response to a question from our newspaper, Konstantin Borovoy stressed that, in his party's opinion, sociopolitical and economic life needs a qualitative boost. Whereas budget spending totals approximately 18 trillion rubles [R] with R6 trillion and R1.5 trillion being spent on defense and social programs respectively, everything else effectively represents the taxpayers' enforced remuneration of the ineffective state economy. Regrettably, the new and old nomenklatura, whose only aim is power, is still at the helm. There are many agreeable people in government today, Konstantin Borovoy stressed, but there are only three individuals with whom you can do business. Well, it is a good thing that there are no fewer. At least, three's company... [mogut sbrositsya na troikh]

Despite the fact that Borovoy is taking part in the work of the "political" section, he could not abandon the economic theme: He sees a solution to the economic crisis solely in destroying ineffective production units and moving manpower and financial resources to economically profitable sectors.

In his customary manner, Borovoy pointed out something that he found surprising in the conference's work: "There has been no schizophrenia at all" during the discussions so far.

Which you might well question...

More on Groups' Progress

PM1006144193 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 9 Jun 93 p 2

[Unattributed report under "Constitutional Conference—Day Three": "Work in the Sections Proceeding Stormily in Some Places, Calmly in Others"]

[Text] **Group 1. Representatives of Russian Federation Federal Organs of Power**

Government Chairman V. Chernomyrdin opened the work of the section with a short introductory speech.

Having determined the work procedure, the members of the section started to examine the existing summarized amendments to the Draft Fundamental Law, starting with the Preamble.

The section voted in favor of granting equal rights to all components of the Federation.

In all, 16 articles of the first chapter of the draft constitution were examined. The overwhelming majority of amendments were rejected. There were proposals to consider combining chapters 1 and 2.

Group 2. Representatives of Organs of State Power of Republics Within the Russian Federation, Krays, Oblasts, the Autonomous Oblast, Autonomous Okrugs, and the Cities of Moscow and St. Petersburg

S.M. Shakhray opened the sitting. He stressed that this group is the most representative and called on his

colleagues to work calmly and constructively; he alerted them to the need to search for compromise on the controversial issues, and he also expressed regret over the conflict which occurred 5 June.

Representatives of many components (Republic of Sakha-Yakutia, Bashkortostan, Kalmykia, Nizhnyy Novgorod Oblast, Kamchatka Oblast, and others) complained that amendments to the Constitution proposed by these components did not go into both volumes of amendments to the Constitution. The following proposal was made and adopted: To prepare and circulate to the conference participants consolidated tables of all amendments, including the amendments gathered by the Supreme Soviet Constitutional Commission.

Then the participants in the sitting went on to discuss the amendments.

In the afternoon, N. Ryabov, deputy chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, took part in the work of the section, taking his seat in the presidium.

During the discussion and adoption of the first amendments there again arose a debate on the actual **discussion procedure**: Whether to take as a basis an article from the presidential draft or the parliamentary draft. The chairman explained that the task of the conference is to elaborate a **single text** on the basis of both existing drafts, and it is not necessary to specially single out where a particular article or idea has been taken from.

The following were adopted during the discussion of the amendments:

1. The Preamble;

2. Section 1.

The following decisions were also adopted at the morning sitting:

1) to recommend the convening of a plenary sitting on Wednesday (9 June);

2) to hand over the first seven articles of the presidential draft and 12 articles of the Constitutional Commission [as published] to experts to integrate a decision by 1800 hours 8 June.

During examination of the amendments to the chapter "Rights and Freedoms of the Individual and the Citizen," chairman A.S. Tyazhlov noted that for this chapter there are only amendments to the presidential draft and none to the Constitutional Commission draft.

Amendments to a number of articles were adopted.

Group 3. Representatives of Local Self-Government

Three sittings (morning, afternoon, and evening) were held at a fairly high organizational and creative level.

Government Deputy Chairman Yu.F. Yarov chaired the sitting.

The participants expressed the wish to hold a plenary sitting as a reconciliatory and stabilizing factor, and as an opportunity for colleagues who left the conference 5 June to return to work.

The discussion was a calm and thoughtful one. On many issues the participants found a common language and voted by an overwhelming majority. When necessary they consulted experts and, as a rule, received competent and clearly expounded explanations. The legal consultants played an important role in creating an atmosphere of businesslike cooperation and creative examination of the draft Constitution.

Group 4. Representatives of Political Parties, Trade Union, Youth, and Other Social Organizations, Mass Movements, and Religions

At the start of the sitting it was found that the hall provided for the group could not hold all the section participants simultaneously. The organizers had simply not expected that number of participants in this section. However, after a decision was adopted to move the section to another hall as of the second sitting, proceedings got under way.

Following a discussion of organizational questions and the conduct of business it was decided to adhere to the standing orders proposed in the president's edict and to pursue consultation and coordination after 1800 hours.

O. Rumyantsev spoke out against discussing the presidential draft, after urging that the amendments not be discussed but that work be done on the alternative draft. However, both drafts of the new Constitution were included for the discussion.

After the first recess the proposal by A. Vladislavlev ("Renewal" faction) was adopted: to discuss in parallel with the discussion of the draft Constitution the drafts of the Law on Elections and the Law on Federal Organs of Power—"in order to untie the knot of political struggle."

Discussion of the text of the amendments started at 1300 hours, and there immediately ensued a debate on the "social state" ["sotsialnoye gosudarstvo"]. A vote was held only on the "social state" amendment, which was not carried.

Articles 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 were discussed as a whole.

Discussion of the drafts of the Law on Elections and the Law on Federal Organs of Power is expected for the following day.

By and large, all discussion in the section bears the nature of a debate. During the discussion of amendments connected with trade union activity a decision was adopted (at A. Sobchak's proposal) that the trade union representatives finalize the amendment to Article 23 bearing in mind the provisions of both drafts.

Group 5. Representatives of Commodity Producers and Entrepreneurs

Following a discussion of questions of the order of business in the upcoming days, a report by S.S. Alekseyev on the principles of building the new Constitution was heard.

A decision was adopted to work according to [po] the amendments to the Constitution, because this was envisaged in the Russian Federation president's edict.

The afternoon sitting was introduced by V. Shumeyko and was addressed by S. Alekseyev on the basic principles of the draft Constitution. Then Alekseyev answered questions. A list of amendments was drawn up for discussion. The order of business proposed by Shumeyko was adopted in its entirety, and it was decided to involve groups of experts from among the conference participants in the section's sitting.

Many participants in the group's sitting signed a leaflet which expressed regret over what happened at the plenary sitting 5 June and condemned the "tactic of denying speakers a hearing by recourse to rhythmic clapping."

The main work began in the afternoon. Voting regulations were elaborated at 1500 hours. It was decided to discuss amendments which received five votes.

The stormiest discussion was generated by the question of including the words "the Federation Treaty as an inalienable part of the Constitution." The participants did not agree with the elaborators' proposal to retain this formula as a recognition of the prevailing reality in Russia and insisted that it be excluded.

Work proceeded calmly, but by the end of the day differences of approach had become more noticeable, and the participants more emotional.

Yeltsin Victories Are 'Defeats for Russia'

PM1006124793 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jun 93 p 2

[Zakhar Snegirev report: "Maze of Kremlin Traps. Constitutional Orgy Threatens Collapse of Russia"]

[Text] Events at the Constitutional Conference on the day it opened attest quite eloquently to Russia's entry into a new, difficult, and—to be blunt—extremely dangerous stage of the formation of its statehood.

This stage, we should note, began not today but three years ago. For, after adopting the Declaration on RSFSR State Sovereignty 12 June 1990, the Russian legislators not only "gave up on" the Soviet Union (a fact which was formally enshrined at Belovezhskaya Forest in December 1991) but also arbitrarily changed the vector of the historic development of Russian statehood. For the first time in its history, Russia had abandoned its main mission of being the "load-bearing structure," the "backbone" of a mighty and influential state—be it the Russian Empire or the Soviet Union.

Since then the process of the gradual erosion of the Russian Federation itself has become irreversible, which is confirmed by recent events linked by the logic of the regions' actions in the struggle with the Union center. The Moscow authorities have been unable to counter intra-Russian separatism with any kind of considered, integrated, and consistent policy aimed at bringing about genuine federalism.

They have tried to compensate for this loss of control over events with a clumsy policy of "appeasement" flimsily disguised in democratic colors. Unfortunately, the Federation Treaty, which was presented as a major breakthrough on the road to building a new Russian statehood, forms part of this context.

But the opportunities for "freezing" the existing and reemergent contradictions and conflicts are not infinite. And the events of March-April this year have given some very definite connotations to the statehood problem. Whereas the Seventh Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies merely raised the question of the need to urgently elaborate a mechanism for implementing the Federation Treaty, the two subsequent congresses started to implement it and it became a terrible weapon in the political struggle.

Thus, Russia's current rulers have fallen into the trap that they themselves had set for their "junior" colleagues—the leaders of the republics and other Federation components—by striving to get the Federation Treaty signed "at all costs" (as was the case with Bashkortostan, for instance). After all, implementation of its provisions in full will inevitably lead to the gradual transformation of the Russian Federation into a confederal-style state formation.

But the leaders of Russian Federation components are today concerned more about their own rights and the independence that should reinforce the mechanism of implementing this document. Moreover, their power is daily expanding and strengthening in direct proportion to the way it is slipping out of the federal organs' hands. Events in Tatarstan, Chechnya, Mordovia, Chelyabinsk Oblast, and other areas have graphically shown official Moscow that the local political elites do not intend to tolerate outside pressure or figures pursuing a policy that is not to their liking.

Boris Yeltsin and his team, judging by everything, see a new constitution as the answer to this situation and are trying to hustle at an accelerated pace to lure the republics and the regions into the "procrustean bed" of the president's constitution. But this constitutional orgy is more likely to compound the situation than to save it.

The participation by representatives of state power from Federation components in the work of the Constitutional Conference does not tell us anything as yet. First,

they realize perfectly well that the Yeltsin draft constitution will not be adopted in the form in which it was published 30 April. Moreover, they also realize that it would be illegitimate to bypass the supreme organ of state power—the Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies—in adopting a new constitution.

Not even a referendum—the radical democrats' favorite ploy—would save matters, since it too would not guarantee the desired result. Certain regions might simply not even hold it, citing the relevant provisions of their own constitutions, or "twisting" the question to provide the result required. This would result in the appearance on the political map of the Russian Federation of a considerable number of "blank spots" where the old Constitution would have ceased to operate but a new one had not yet come into force.

The main reason why the Federation components are taking part in the Constitutional Conference, in my view, is their desire for full participation in the "major political horse trade" relating to the adoption of a new fundamental law. I think they are not so interested in the fruitless struggle between the representative authorities and the executive that has bored everyone to tears. The main thing for them is to keep control over the actual process of confrontation and to prevent any strengthening of one or other branch of power that could pose a threat to them.

The Federation components are also worried about the growing struggle within the "corps" of the components themselves. This struggle, we would note, was preordained because of the quite absurd idea—from the standpoint of the normal functioning of a federal state—of the "multitiered" legal status of its components. In the specific context of Russia—where the indigenous people, the Russians, who make up the overwhelming majority of the population, have not had their own national state for centuries (at least formally)—this is the road to the collapse of Russia, a road to nowhere.

The outcome of this struggle is already obvious. The krays and oblasts, with the direct or indirect support of the federal authorities, are increasingly persistently raising the question of the need to provide equal legal status for Federation components. And certain areas—Vologda Oblast, for instance—are already seriously discussing the question of turning an administrative-territorial formation into a republic. This "Vologda phenomenon" could seriously alter the correlation of forces between the national republics and the "Russian regions."

In formal terms the republics do not object to enhancing the status of the krays and oblasts. But, needless to say, not to the detriment of their own interests. They do not want to lose the advantages afforded by the position of "sovereign state." If the krays and oblasts do nonetheless get what they want, these advantages will inevitably be eroded. Then it would be necessary, first, to renegotiate the Federation Treaty—something that the republics would hardly be likely to concede. Second, it would invariably lead to a new spiral of the "sovereignization" of national republics, whereby not just a couple but almost all of them would demand the status of states in association with Russia. And, once again, a confederation would be inevitable.

The results of the 26 May session of the Heads of Republic Council and, in particular, the widely trumpeted statement by the leaders of the 16 Federation components as a whole confirm the existence of a pernicious trend toward the "confederalization" of the country. Particularly noteworthy in this regard is Point 3 of the statement, which directly states that "relations unregulated by the Federation Treaty framework can be regulated on the basis of bilateral treaties and agreements between the federal authorities and Federation components, including republics which have not yet signed the Federation Treaty."

The Heads of Republic Council session also showed that the local leaders are not as hostile toward the system of soviets as the president's side constantly is. In most cases the soviets are their strategic allies and support. After all, the system of the soviets, which has suddenly become an insuperable obstacle to "reform," has been and continues to be not just a unique form of the organization of state power. In the absence of a developed multiparty system that adequately reflects the political interests of various social strata and groups, the soviets are today playing a special restraining, coordinating, and consolidating role.

The Federal Assembly with which the authors of the Yeltsin constitution plan to replace the Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet will hardly be able to cope with carrying out this important role of the soviets. Conceived of as a "parliament under an enlightened monarch" and without any effective levers of influence over the behavior of presidential and government structures, it would be doomed to impotence.

That is why it is not ruled out that the next few months will see still further confirmation of the very accurate conclusion reached by certain political scientists—that all Yeltsin's victories are without exception defeats for Russia. And the more convincing Yeltsin's victories are, the more tangible the blow to Russian statehood.

More Concessions to Republics Seen Likely

PM1106100993 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jun 93 p 2

[Ravil Zaripov article under the "Political Forecast" rubric: "Can You Win a Constitution in a Lottery?"]

[Text] What prospects are there for the Constitutional Conference? Which of the designated ways of adopting the constitution will the president's team choose, and what are its chances of success? Most of the conversations behind the scenes at the conference revolve around these questions.

It should be admitted that the Constitutional Conference has turned out to be fairly representative, even though some of the invitees—about 50 persons (out of a theoretical total of 762 delegates)—left the hall together with Ruslan Khasbulatov (several of them backtracked). The remaining delegates will have to agree the presidential draft constitution taking into account a great mass of amendments (186 pages of text). While there is a common aim, participants at the conference differ on ways of achieving it (and have different timetables). Sergey Filatov, leader of the president's administration (who was directly responsible for organizing the conference), said in conversation with journalists that he considers that the debate at it is pointless: Discussion has already taken place in the regions. Here there is a clearly defined task which must be carried out. Vice Premier Sergey Shakhray considers that to get everyone to agree on the constitution is an enormous task, "but we are hoping to get a majority to agree." Republic of Tatarstan President Mintimer Shaymiyev told a KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent more than definitely: "It is too soon to say that the presidential draft will be adopted. Work on it will be begun." Viktor Stepanov, chairman of the Republic of Karelia Supreme Soviet, links the conference's success to the viewpoints of the leading players—the president, his team, and the parliamentary leadership—and to the possibility of a compromise between them. In his opinion there is another significant factor along the road to adopting the constitution—namely the "absence of a conception of the kind of Russia we wish to see."

For the moment the conference's participants are working in five sections, the most important of which (not in terms of status, but with regard to the nitty-gritty) brings together representatives of the Federation components: republics, krays, oblasts, and autonomous formations. In discussion with Sergey Tsyplyayev, the Russian Federation president's representative in St. Petersburg, we agreed that the main obstacle in producing a coordinated draft will certainly not be issues concerning the distribution of powers between the president and parliament. The main sore point lies in the relations between republics, krays, and oblasts. It is well known that the republics are demanding 50 percent of the seats in parliament's upper chamber, which will resolve the fundamental Federation issues (for example: declarations of war and peace, ratification of international treaties, the introduction of a state of emergency or martial law, sending troops abroad, etc.). In effect the chamber would be completely under the control of the republics, where only 15 percent of Russia's population lives. The krays and oblasts will not agree to such an option. "In a local referendum in St. Petersburg, 75 percent of participants demanded, as a minimum, equal rights with the republics," Tsyplyayev confirmed.

Let us suppose that the Constitutional Conference succeeds in achieving what we want—an agreed draft. Even then we will be a long way from adopting a new constitution. The majority of the representatives who have come to Moscow are not empowered to initial the document. The republic heads present at the conference will also not take such a step, having given the final say to their parliaments. There the situation looks uncertain. Karelian Supreme Soviet Chairman Stepanov has frankly admitted that his parliament did "not consider it possible to take any of the proposed draft constitutions as a basis." Tatarstan leader Shaymiyev has confirmed that the previous position is unchanged: His republic's relations with Russia should be introduced into the fundamental law's new draft. So the process of initialing could become permanent.

The second basic question is: How should the new constitution be adopted? Having at the outset rejected the Congress as an organ incapable of this action, Boris Yeltsin has been forced to return to it. Here it is a matter not so much of the president making concessions to requests from elsewhere as of the fact that adopting the constitution via the Congress is the most legitimate and favorable option. But is it possible to get two-thirds of the deputies to love the president? Fat chance! A tactical move which (in the opinion of several presidential team members) would bring the situation closer to the desired result could be a change of parliamentary speaker, who is rallying the Congress to the idea of opposing Yeltsin. Moves in this direction have had some success: The split in the Supreme Soviet Presidium has severely weakened Khasbulatov's position. But the fact that the latter was chased from the podium at the Constitutional Conference while the hall stamped its feet was, in the author's opinion, such a rash step that it helped bring about the opposite result—strengthening the position of the speaker, who has emerged as the aggrieved party. Following the classical rules of political struggle, the president will most likely begin separate talks with members of the Supreme Soviet Presidium and the leaders of the individual factions. But even in this case there remains a lottery with minimal chances of a win. The Congress will become a winning "card" for Yeltsin only when the most of the Federation components initial the draft constitution. Then the Congress will be confronted with a difficult choice: either to accept the agreed point of view, or to sign its own death sentence. There can be no doubt that the Russian president will make quite a few concessions to the Federation components. One of them is already indicated in his report. When stating the need for new elections to the Russian parliament as a federal structure, Yeltsin made the proviso that the terms of office of republic, kray, and oblast deputies should not be cut short.

In the opinion of the presidential team, the referendum will be a repeat attempt to get the constitution adopted if the Congress rejects the draft. In this case the lottery will have to be taken out of the Grand Kremlin Palace—the venue for the Congresses—and extended to country as a whole. This is at a time when the voters' optimism is falling inexorably with the ruble. The recent referendum showed that to secure a majority of those eligible to vote is in such circumstances a practically impossible task. To

lower such a high target—for example, to 50 percent of those who actually go to vote—does not appear possible as the referendum would change the constitution and the question of legitimacy would immediately appear on the agenda.

Then there would be the adoption of a constitutional law on early elections to parliament, which after this would adopt the new constitution. The president has determined that the early elections should take place no later than October. I think that few people idealize the Russian parliament at the present time, and Yeltsin's demand is prompted by a long series of clashes with the Supreme Soviet. But what will happen about the results of April's referendum, in particular, about the negative reply to the fourth question? There is another troubling point. Is it possible to assert that the newly elected parliament will accept the agreed presidential draft? The situation in the Supreme Soviet may become even more complicated for Yeltsin, as it will most likely be an organized opposition with strict party and factional discipline which replaces the divided opposition.

A Constituent Conference convened solely to adopt the constitution is the focal point of many questions. For example, on what principle should delegates be selected for it? Its main defect lies in the fact that this norm is not stipulated by the present Constitution and from a legal point of view needs to be introduced into the fundamental law. Otherwise once again the question would arise of the legitimacy of the forum itself and of the documents adopted at it.

The proclamation as the constitution of the document which already bears the components' signatures—the Federation Treaty—may be a way out of the situation which has developed. All the remaining questions could be resolved by constitutional laws. Be that as it may, for the president the road to the new constitution lies via a series of concessions to the Federation components, primarily to those whose independence of view is bolstered by oil wells, coal mines, and diamond deposits. The remainder, which are less well endowed with natural wealth and are suffering from poor economic potential, will be more compliant. And Boris Yeltsin will have to adhere to the soccer maxim: "Strong clubs mean a single national team."

Faction Coordinators Assail Conference, Events

PM1106091393 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 10 Jun 93 First Edition p 2

[Aleksey Vorobyev report: "Parliamentary Factions: No Sign of Compromise As Yet"]

[Text] "All the preparations for the Constitutional Conference showed that in terms of the nature of the discrimination against political opponents this event exceeds even the worst traditions of party forums"—that was how Deputy Ivan Rybkin began his speech at the 8 June session of the coordinators of the "Fatherland," "Russia," and "Communists of Russia" parliamentary factions. "Our fears were confirmed; it became clear on 5 June that the conference organizers will stop at nothing to ensure agreement of opinion."

Those gathered for the session were familiarized with the statement by A. Kotenkov, chief of the Russian president's State-Legal Directorate, to the effect that a final draft Constitution will nonetheless be signed in some back room by three men, and they will tell the public that the coauthors of the new constitution are supposedly a worker, a kolkhoz [collective farm] worker, and a couple of pensioners.

The leader of the "Communists of Russia" faction described the means of political campaigning at the Constitutional Conference as "macho authoritarianism."

He developed this idea by saying that sessions of many oblast soviets currently being held are voicing their rejection of this impudent political practice adopted by the Kremlin team, and extremely unexpected details are, moreover, coming to light during these sessions. For instance, it emerged at the Moscow Oblast Soviet session that when the president allowed another two experts to join the two plenipotentiary representatives from the oblast, the inner soviet sent esteemed, worthy people to the conference. But when they turned up at the Kremlin they failed to find their names on the lists, someone had put totally different names there. Who is to blame for this blatant forgery?

The organization of the conference reminded General B. Tarasov, leader of the "Fatherland" faction, of classic military command-staff games.

Sergey Baburin, leader of the "Russia" faction and the Russian National Union, described how Doctor of Juridical Sciences Anatoliy Lukyanov, the Russian National Union's representative, was not allowed to take part in the conference and stressed that even members of "Democratic Russia" were forced to admit that the charges against Lukyanov in the State Committee for the State of Emergency case do not rob him of any political rights.

Deputy Ivan Fedoseyev, secretary of the Constitutional Commission, added to the unprepossessing picture of political anarchy reigning at the Constitutional Conference. Unlike his faction colleagues, he came to this event hoping for a compromise between the various branches of power and social groups that would result in a charter of national accord being formulated. A special edition of the journal KONSTITUTSIONNYY VESTNIK was published with a view to securing this compromise, analyzing in detail the two draft constitutions and making recommendations as to discussing the constitution. But the journal was not handed out to the conference participants. Sergey Filatov, leader of the president's administration, banned that, I. Fedoseyev said.

This seemingly minor fact in a long line of similar unpleasantness only served to emphasize that the people behind the conference have no intention of reaching any

compromises and alternative viewpoints are of no interest to them. Therefore the hopes for accord of many of those who took part in it have rapidly been dispelled.

The faction coordinators said that the disgraceful episode at Saturday's session in the Kremlin when the guards dared to insult people's deputies will be the subject of a special deputies' question.

What would have happened in any civilized state to people who dared to publicly raise a hand against the general prosecutor? To whom should a deputies' question now be directed? And who will find the strength to apologize for what happened in an equally public manner?

Conference's Impact on Supreme Soviet Viewed

PM1006132993 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 9 Jun 93 p 1

[Lyubov Tsukanova report: "Constitutional Conference: New Intrigues and Dramas"]

[Text] The Constitutional Conference's very first two days of work confirmed that the most debated questions will be those which touch on the powers of the federal authorities (especially the president and parliament) and the relationship between the center and the components of the federation subjects and also between the components of the Russian Federation themselves—the republics on the one hand, and the krays and oblasts on the other. In the opinion of Sergey Stankevich, adviser to the president and a conference participant, the first major political result of the conference can be considered to be the fact that the representatives of the organs of state power supported the idea of making the various components of the federation equal in status. Stankevich said cautiously, "they apparently supported it." Vladimir Shumeyko confirmed: Indeed, the first group voted for an amendment establishing the equal socioeconomic status of all components of the federation. The commodity producers' and entrepreneurs' group also accepted the same amendment.

From other events, the following is remarkable: The political parties' and social movements' group have initiated the formation of a sort of subgroup to prepare a draft law on elections to the federal parliament. This idea is supported by the majority of leaders of parties and movements, which is totally unsurprising: Whereas for the president early elections are a means of overcoming the political crisis, for the political parties they are a test of their strength with the voters, a means of making themselves known, of making an impression on the public consciousness. The real question is how to rouse the Supreme Soviet to adopt such a law. It is well known that parliament's own draft law has still not yet been discussed even in its first reading. And all desire on the part of the Supreme Soviet to hold early elections has disappeared following the referendum. Presumably the early cessation of their powers is a highly painful topic for the present parliament, and it cannot be ruled out that it was the president's proposal to hold such elections in October of this year that offended deputies most of all on the first day of the Constitutional Conference's work.

The desire to elaborate a draft law on elections in tandem with the process of agreeing the text of the Constitution is understandable. Some conference participants predict that "incidental questions," especially those connected with the mechanism for adopting the Basic Law, could come to the fore. Primarily because the legitimacy of the adoption method is the most important condition for the components of the federation. Ruslan Khasbulatov and the Supreme Soviet talk tirelessly about the constitutional path. The bare suspicion that Yeltsin intends to bypass the Congress was sufficient for the supreme representative organ first to call into question the Constitutional Conference's legitimacy, and then to fret about whether or not to attend for more than a month. A second sacramental question of whether or not to return will probably be decided in the Supreme Soviet today, Wednesday. The issue is not that of a physical return, if it is possible so to speak (many of those who walked out, including O. Rumyantsev, organization secretary of the Constitutional Commission, have been working at the conference since Monday), but of a political decision on this score. Will Ruslan Khasbulatov be apprised of the impropriety of his behavior, or, on the contrary, will the halo of martyr increase the deputies' fondness for him? It is well known that there is no unity within the parliamentary leadership on this score; most Presidium members blame the Supreme Soviet itself for the awkward situation having arisen, since the latter made up its mind to participate in the Constitutional Conference at the last moment, after the standing orders had already been announced. At Friday's session of the Constitutional Commission, for instance, Mikhail Mityukov, chairman of the Committee for Legislation, tried to warn colleagues that an awkward situation could arise if the Supreme Soviet spent a lot of time trying to impose its working procedures, but was not heeded.

The disagreements in the Supreme Soviet Presidium are, for political reasons, not currently being submitted to public censure, but it is clear that the attitude to Khasbulatov's action is far from ecstatic. The reaction of "Khasbulatov's nestlings," however, will most likely not be critical.

Political Issues

Yeltsin Addresses Nation on Independence Day

LD1106125393 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1100 GMT 11 Jun 93

[Independence Day address to the nation by President Boris Yeltsin; place and date not given—read by announcer]

[Text] Dear citizens of Russia: Today Russia is marking its state holiday, Independence Day. This holiday is

young; it appeared in our life only three years ago when the declaration of Russia's state sovereignty was adopted. At the time a new chapter opened in the 1,000-year history of our state, and it depends on us what will be written in it and what our descendants will read about our present day.

Having started renewing Russian society, we are looking for our own path. Russia is an enormous and original country, and one must not impose on it things which are at variance with its spirit, traditions, and foundations. We have a rich and centuries-long past. Russia knew times when the state oppressed the individual and became stronger at the expense of his property and freedom. But there has also been a different Russia with different traditions, primarily the powerful tradition of hard work and high professionalism like that embodied in the Russian folklore hero who shod a flea. Our past encompasses the priceless experience of the reforms of Peter the Great, Aleksandr II, Petr Stolypin, the experience of Russian industrialists and entrepreneurs. We keep the traditions of the free spirit of [Andrey] Rublev and [Aleksandr] Pushkin, [Lev] Tolstoy, and [Aleksandr] Solzhenitsyn, plus the legacy of Academician Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov.

Like other peoples, Russian citizens are striving for freedom, happiness, prosperity, possession of property, and for being the master. We are moving toward democracy and the market, because this is the only way to attain greater freedom and greater prosperity for the majority. Our life is beginning to change. Freedom, the possibility to work for oneself, for one's family, and for one's future is gradually taking hold in Russia, too.

Of course, not everybody feels at ease in the new conditions. There are bewilderment and disappointment in our life, too. Some people see everything that is taking place as a personal tragedy, but our difficult times are like that. We are learning to help these people find their place in a life which is new for all of us.

Over the last 18 months, thousands of enterprises have been handed over to labor collectives. Millions of people are becoming shareholders, opening their own businesses, or getting land in private ownership. All this is bringing about new possibilities for showing initiative and increasing personal well-being.

The enormous work aimed at reviving Russia is developing in an inconspicuous and latent way. Unfortunately, we are very much behind with political reforms. This resulted in a sharp confrontation, especially in the first months of this year. It seemed that everything was on the brink of collapse. But despite this, peace and stability were preserved in Russia. On yet another occasion, our people have shown themselves to be wiser than those who are so keen to speak on their behalf.

Russian citizens never were and never will be indifferent to the future of Russia. This was once again confirmed at the 25 April referendum. My supporters and those who disagree with the president's policy took part in the voting, but by participating in the referendum they were calling for a peaceful and civilized way of solving problems; they were opposing confrontation. We prefer voting to barricades, and together we defended civil peace again.

That is why the May Day events in Moscow provoked such a shock. Having lost in an honest and peaceful contest at the referendum, the forces of irreconcilable opposition tried—and will perhaps try again—to provoke disorder and to sow trouble and chaos in the country. They are still dangerous. But Russian citizens can no longer be lured by populist calls or be made to confront one another by yesterday's slogans.

Russia's political life is currently focused on the issue of a new constitution and the work of the Constitutional Conference. Even recently, it would have been impossible to gather such a forum; but now we have various people working side by side at the conference: representatives of the executive, the president, and government; Supreme Soviet deputies; chiefs of Russian territories, leaders of political parties, movements, and public organizations; religious figures; economic managers, industrialists, entrepreneurs, representatives of small and large towns and local self-government. In fact, all of Russia is represented at the conference. People of the most different beliefs and views have come together, and they have found resources for joint work. This is fundamentally important.

This is evidence that our society has really started to progress toward political stabilization. It is not just the country's citizens that are fed up with confrontation; political forces, the authorities, and Russia itself are fed up with it.

The work underway at the conference is being carried out in a correct and deeply professional manner. Not a single useful idea is being discarded. Figuratively speaking, the future constitution is being put to the test of a civic society. This serious and involved work and this sense of responsibility for the State represent the future image of the Russian parliamentary system yet to come, a system our people deserve, a system we need so much.

Like all countries, Russia has its own national interests. We are striving to defend them calmly and firmly. However, we will find it difficult to develop our Russian home without firm relations with the closest of our neighboring countries.

Dear friends, great nation of mine, united by a line of generations, in reforming Russia we bear the greatest responsibility, and not only toward our contemporaries. Let us strive toward this lofty goal: to make Russia mighty and respected and to make our own lives dignified and free. I am confident that together we will be successful.

Greetings to you, dear people of Russia, on our Independence Day, Russia's day.

Khasbulatov Suffering From High Blood Pressure

LD1106101793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0739 GMT 11 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Novikov]

[Text] Moscow June 11 TASS—Russian Parliament Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov has a high blood pressure which was caused by overwork and tiredness, Parliament Spokesman Yuriy Marechenkov told TASS on Friday [11 June] quoting Khasbulatov's doctors.

He added that the speaker was not hospitalised and stays at home.

On Thursday Khasbulatov felt unwell after a conference with regional heads of soviets and before a crucial speech he had to deliver upon the instructions of the parliament at the Constitutional Conference convened by President Boris Yeltsin.

Shaposhnikov Agrees To Head Security Council

LD1106113093 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1052 GMT 11 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Andrey Naryshkin and Sergey Ostanin]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 11 June— Air Marshal Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, commander in chief of the CIS Joint Armed Forces, has accepted an invitation from Boris Yeltsin, the president of Russia, to become secretary of the Security Council. The public relations center of the Chief Command of the CIS Joint Armed Forces informed an ITAR-TASS correspondent of this today. [passage omitted]

As we know, the position of secretary of Russia's Security Council became vacant on 10 May, when Yuriy Skokov was released from the post by a decree issued by the Russian Federation president.

Informed sources at the Chief Command predict that, once this structure has been reorganized, it may be headed by Colonel General Boris Gromov, who is currently deputy defense minister of the Russian Federation. At the same time, in accordance with existing agreements, the removal and appointment of the commander in chief of the CIS Joint Armed Forces is the prerogative of the Council of CIS Heads of State.

Council of Ministers Presidium Meets 10 Jun

Discusses Budget, Forms Commission

LD1006121293 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1000 GMT 10 Jun 93

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] Another session of the presidium of the Russian Council of Ministers took place at Staraya Square today. Viktor Chernomyrdin opened the session by requesting all ministries and departments to submit within a week considerations on reducing the expenditure sections of their budgets by at least 20 percent. After that, a decision was made to set up a commission for operational matters under the government. The commission will coordinate the activity of federal bodies of administration aimed at implementing economic reforms and will monitor the fulfillment of the president's and the government's decisions. The commission will be headed by Oleg Soskovets, deputy head of government, while the headquarters of operational management of reforms will include Anatoliy Chubays, Aleksandr Shokhin, Yuriy Yarov, and Boris Fedorov. The prime minister rejected a package of documents aimed at ensuring the proper operation of transport and requested that the ministers of transport and railways submit proposals within a week on sources of financing and credits for the industry.

The machine-building program for the agro-complex, which was approved as a whole, is no less important. Although nine trillion rubles will be required to implement it, only a third of this sum will be expected to be paid from the state budget.

Machine-Building Program Approved

LD1006225293 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1040 GMT 10 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow, 10 Jun (TASS)—A draft federal state program to develop machine-building for Russia's agro-industrial complex was approved today by the Presidium of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers. It is to cover the period up to 1998, when agriculture's technical requirements should have been fully met.

Implementation of the program will enable labor productivity in the sector to be raised by 80 to 100 percent and the output of agricultural produce to be increased by 20 to 40 percent, Agriculture Minister Viktor Khlystun declared. He expressed the idea that "its success depends, above all, on whether the necessary funding, about 9 trillion rubles is forthcoming."

The supply of machinery and equipment to agriculture and processing enterprises has now fallen to the level of the mid-seventies, and more than half of the equipment is obsolete, the text of the program points out. About half of the workforce in plant-growing and livestock farming are obliged to do manual labor. Nearly 40 percent of the production of equipment for the countryside is now in other CIS countries. The situation is slowing down reform of the agro-industrial complex, and food production is declining sharply.

The program provides for the creation and production of over 3,000 different kinds of agricultural machinery and equipment for processing, as well as the modernization of virtually all equipment for the countryside produced at Russian enterprises.

During discussion of the program, Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin particularly drew the attention of those attending the session to the need to expand the production of technologies for processing agricultural produce and to the better use of benefits from the conversion of defense factories.

At the session of the Presidium of the Council of Ministers, a decision was adopted setting up a government commission for day-to-day matters. Deputy Prime Minister Oleg Soskovets was appointed chairman. The commission has been set up "to consider and decide on day-to-day matters relating to the implementation of economic reform and the exercise of systematic control over the speed at which effect is given to vital presidential and government decisions."

A draft program of urgent measures to ensure the stable functioning of Russian transport in 1993 was rejected at the session, because it did not identify any concrete measures to stabilize work in the sector or the sources of funding.

Viktor Chernomyrdin announced that today he intended to sign an instruction directing all Russian ministries and departments to analyze their budgets within a week and to reduce their expenditure by 20 percent, while boosting revenue by the same amount. This decision was taken, according to him, following an analysis of the progress being made with implementing the Russian budget for 1993.

Further on Presidium Meeting

PM1106095593 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 11 Jun 93 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Council of Ministers Presidium"]

[Text] At Viktor Chernomyrdin's proposal the Government Presidium approved on 10 June a provision on the cabinet commission for operational questions. This new organ has been charged with resolving operational questions to ensure the implementation of economic reform and state selective structural policy and coordinate the activity of the central organs of management, except for questions within the competence of the Council of Ministers, its chairman and Presidium, and the other standing commissions.

The new commission is also charged with monitoring the fulfillment of the president's most important decisions and the government's decrees.

The commission will be headed by Russian Federation First Vice Premier Oleg Soskoveyets. In accordance with the government draft decree it will include Vice Premiers Anatoliy Chubays, Aleksandr Shokhin, and Yuriy Yarov and also Andrey Shapovalyants, first deputy minister of the economy, and Igor Churchov, chairman of the committee for industrial policy.

The head of the Russian Federation cabinet also issued a directive to ministers and federal department leaders to prepare within a week proposals for the reduction of the relevant expenditure items of the state budget (for which the relevant ministries and departments are responsible) by 20 percent or an increase in the revenue items of 20 percent. The premier stressed that each leader of a federal organ of executive power will be personally obliged to report on the fulfillment of this instruction.

The head of cabinet removed from discussion the question of urgent measures to ensure the steady operation of transport in the Russian Federation in 1993, included in the session's preliminary agenda, because it was not sufficiently prepared. In the opinion of the Council of Ministers chairman the claims from the Ministry of Transport and the Ministry of Railways, which are demanding that in 1993 they be granted 1.3 trillion rubles as financial aid, are dictated only by the desire to obtain money from the budget without seeking financing through internal resources.

As a whole the presidium approved the draft state program for the development of machine building for the agro-industrial complex for 1993-1998 and decreed that work be completed on it within a month taking into account the proposals made at the session. At the same time the premier and other cabinet members criticized the program particularly for the use of old "state plan approaches," for its failure to consider the interests of the consumer and commodity producers' forecasts of effective demand, and on a number of other subjects.

V. Chernomyrdin announced that he had made a proposal for the restoration of the Russian Federation committee for agricultural machine building, which had been supported by President Boris Yeltsin.

Zorkin Discusses Court's Role, Conference

PM1006140193 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 10 Jun 93 p 1

[Interview with Valeriy Zorkin, chairman of the Constitutional Court, by Zh. Kasyanenko; place and date not given: "Not Living a Lie"]

[Text] In a stable rule-of-law state ordinary citizens have little interest in the work of the Constitutional Court or other organs with similar functions. It is a different matter in Russia, for which the very fact of the existence of a non-politicized, non-timeserving, and finally uncorrupted legal body is not only a new development, but also a source of hope for the preservation of civil peace and legality. The work of the Constitutional Court is followed with great interest not only by politicians and lawyers, but also by millions of people who have no connection with politics, because its decisions one way or another sometimes affect the whole of society and the protection of Russian citizens' rights and freedoms. Valeriy Dmitriyevich Zorkin, chairman of the Russian Federation Constitutional Court, is at the cutting edge of these problems, and naturally he knows better than anyone how often the Constitution is violated in our country.

[Zorkin] In this regard I would paraphrase a well-known politician in our country whom it is no longer customary to quote: Every day, every hour, on a massive scale. Not only the Constitution as such, but also the laws adopted on the basis of it are not implemented in our country, and edicts are not put into effect. The result is the legal free-for-all that we are faced with. Without that there would have been no 20 March [Yeltsin announcement of special rule], there would not have been the episode of the impeachment vote at the Ninth Congress of People's Deputies. All these are links in the same chain where the sides or the branches of power (call them what you will) behave in an extremist manner and refuse to see that in their radicalism they are ruining the state.

We forget that our 1,000-year-old Russia was always diverse and motley but did not disintegrate because of this but, on the contrary, our forebears steered the country and ourselves into the civilized mainstream of peoples. Now we are doing everything to destroy this.

Given the seething political passions and great divergence of opinions the Constitution and the law are the only oasis of tranquillity to which people with all sorts of convictions must cling, whether it is a matter of the National Salvation Front or of "Democratic Russia." For it is only on this basis, for all their difference, that they can unite and move forward together, toward a way out of our extremely profound crisis. There is simply no other way. So I regard yours as a key question. Unless we learn to observe the Constitution and the laws, we will simply collapse, we will perish in squabbles.

[Kasyanenko] And we can adopt however many new constitutions we like, but this will not save us?

[Zorkin] Of course. We are failing to realize that, by remaining prey to radical legal nihilism and putting forward the thesis "Let us adopt a new constitution!" we are being dragged into an inflationary process just as dangerous as the monetary inflation we are already experiencing. In itself the adoption of a new constitution will change nothing unless the reasons for the nonimplementation of laws are eliminated.

[Kasyanenko] What are those reasons?

[Zorkin] There are many. Tradition plays a part, of course. In countries where the law is sacred it is impossible to imagine court decisions being subjected to the sort of mockery that happens in our country. It is simply not done to comment on them, it is customary to implement them. But in our country at the drop of a hat there is a hullabaloo and outcry that the Constitutional Court is politicized and is in the pocket of this figure or that.

When will we realize that no matter how many justices have voted, if there is a majority it means the decision has been adopted and it must be implemented? Yes, the court is not proof against making mistakes, but it is sacred, just as, in general terms, the president or parliament should be sacred. So long as we fail to realize this, the things that ought to be preserved will be pilfered and destroyed.

But there are also deeper reasons for legal nihilism. You have to remember the history of Russia, where the people's spirituality also made it possible to cater for the material side of life. However, there are limits. If today not only are people not materially catered for, but as a result of the renewed course over 90 percent of the population finds itself in poverty and having lost what it had before, is it possible to speak of moderation, the middle ground, and centrism in the absence of even moderate prosperity? This is an extremely profound cause of radicalism, and of the most brutal sort—the radicalism of poverty. It breeds a type of relations where it is appropriate to speak not of a people rallying together on the basis of spiritual values, but of masses deserving pity and sympathy who are lapsing into radicalism and becoming easy prey for demagogues. That is the terrible thing.

[Kasyanenko] Is there any mechanism for defending the Constitutional Court's decisions and monitoring their implementation?

[Zorkin] The law on the Constitutional Court lays down that its decisions are binding. What more should it take than that statement in the law?

At this point I am going to express a view that may not coincide with the generally accepted view. In our country, as soon as a law is published, people immediately say: There is no mechanism for its implementation. Excuse me, but what is the huge mass of state employees, this whole gigantic machine known as the executive branch? The entire hierarchy of functionaries must show concern for the implementation of laws. If the president, as head of the executive branch, sees that his edict, or a Constitutional Court decision, or some other normative act is not being implemented, he must take every measure to rectify the situation. If an official in the top hierarchy acts improperly, the mechanism of constitutional responsibility must be employed. Of course, there will be no progress so long as our legal awareness remains in a ridiculous state.

You asked about the mechanism for implementing the court's decisions. I would ask: What mechanism should there be to implement the president's edict on combating corruption, which was issued in April 1992? After all, there is the prosecutor's office, there are investigative organs, and finally there is the president himself!

[Kasyanenko] At a press conference recently I put a similar question to the minister of internal affairs. He replied to the effect that work to combat corruption is being curbed by the legislators, who have not yet adopted a few decisions in this sphere enabling law enforcement organs to combat this evil.

[Zorkin] And the result is a vicious circle. You cannot cite shortcomings in the system of mutual coordination and on this pretext abandon the fight against corruption.

[Kasyanenko] Now we have moved on to specific problems in our life, I would like to ask you: Leaving aside the fact that the Constitutional Court's decision on compensation for the population's money savings is both constitutional and moral, is it practicable?

[Zorkin] You know, the only considerations that guide the court are those of legality. In the situation with regard to money savings the state simultaneously violated several basic principles of the Constitution: the right of ownership and the right to guaranteed receipt of the products of one's labor. All this requires that it acknowledge its duty. How it is going to carry it out is a separate matter. If it is totally impracticable, it is not because the court is bad but because the government that perpetrated the disaster did not measure its actions and their consequences against the basic norms of constitutionality. And it proved bankrupt from this viewpoint.

[Kasyanenko] Do you often have to make decisions like this one, where the justices, like citizens, know in advance that the decision is impracticable even though it is in line with the law?

[Zorkin] This depends on the readiness of people and the state to live according to the law. Take our decision on the Ministry of Security and Internal Affairs—remember that combination of two power ministries? The court abolished it. And the decision was implemented!

Or take the decision on 20 March. We came in for plenty of brickbats. But at the same time, despite everything, what the president had announced was not implemented. Everything he announced could quite well have been implemented, but certain forces came to the defense of the Constitution, and all this did not work.

Exactly the same thing happened at the Ninth Congress. Again there were brickbats and confrontation, but people's sense of self-preservation operated.

In this connection we can turn to the 25 April referendum. Interpretations of its results are emphasizing that people spoke out in favor of so-and-so and of so-and-so. But did the voters give carte blanche to take any action? Personally, I am inclined to think that the people gave instructions to live in peace and find a common language.

[Kasyanenko] There are constant attacks on the Constitutional Court and its chairman from all sorts of directions, and even from your colleagues. How do you view this?

[Zorkin] You know, I am accused of being thick-skinned and I have apparently grown used to this. But that is not the point. My view of the attacks is based on the same principle: Live in peace. After all, we have stated that we will not live a lie, we will live according to the law. This is not happening straightaway. I hope it will happen, I am not losing hope.

[Kasyanenko] Valeriy Dmitriyevich, where do you come from?

[Zorkin] I was born in the Far East and I lived in Tambov Oblast, then in the Urals, in Troitsk. I spent most of my childhood and early youth there. Then I came to Moscow to study at the law faculty. I lectured at the university and the Ministry of Internal Affairs Academy. Then I worked in the Supreme Soviet Constitutional Commission, and now I am working in the Constitutional Court. My life could certainly have turned out differently. My goal now is the renaissance of Russia. Without that not only I, but none of us will be happy. I don't want to be bombastic and to proclaim my patriotism. Unfortunately, nowadays even this is regarded as bogus, which is a sure indication of the period of degradation which we have entered. The words "motherland" and "patriotism" are becoming "suspect"—people are ashamed or afraid to use them. Certainly only then will we revive the true meaning of these words and begin to live lives worthy of human beings. The concepts of patriotism, motherland, law, and justice must without fail be linked together.

Naturally, my views have evolved over the course of my life, just like anyone's. Maybe God alone does not change, because he is absolute and constant. But the most important point—I would like to hope this—is that I have not changed in the direction of becoming timeserving. Everything changes. I think your newspaper too has changed in some respects. It is now clearly tilting toward centrism and showing concern for Russia, entirely justifying its name. It is gradually accumulating experience of the free press, that is, of not living a lie, in fact, of becoming the "fourth estate." This essentially does not yet exist in our country; it too is at the formative stage, like the other branches of power.

Society's radicalism is also reflected in the press. For instance, after the trial on the CPSU case GLASNOST described me as a latter-day Ulrikh or Vyshinskiy. At the time my colleagues told me I ought to take the paper to court. I refused, aware that newspapers too are susceptible to these growing pains. But I hope I will live to see the day when GLASNOST describes me in different terms. I myself remain in the centrist mainstream that accords with the mood of Russian people and helps to restore peace and national accord. However, I am well aware that this is not enough. If GLASNOST, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, PRAVDA, ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA, and even MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS together were to advocate this, there would indeed be some use in it. Changes in views, an evolution in them, as I see it, are simply essential in order to move forward.

I used to be a CPSU member. Last year's trial helped to clarify why sort of an organization this was. And I think that this was a general moral check for all of us who used

to be party members. The elite, which ruled in the name of communists, deceived us. But we are to blame for not realizing this sooner. Otherwise would we not just have allowed ourselves to be manipulated, but have allowed a great state to be wrecked in the name of communists?

However, now is not the time to establish who bears more of the blame. Now we must save Russia. There were always contradictions and clashes here. But when 1912 or 1941 came along, everything took a back seat and all that remained was the main thing that united us all.

The question of saving our statehood is no less acute now. The state is not some kind of machine that is alien to us. It is us all—the people in their political existence. Unless we save it we will become atomized Ivans who have forgotten their roots, a realm of menial labor for other states. Unfortunately, the tendency toward radicalization can be observed even in the top echelons of power, which does not increase tranquillity in society.

The members of the Constitutional Court saw the idea of convening the [constitutional] conference as precisely an opportunity to achieve accord and they prepared for it their own comments on specific provisions of the published draft fundamental law. What was encouraging? Russia is not limited to the Kremlin and the parliamentary "White House." A huge power will be represented at this conference by mighty components of the Federation—republics, krays, and oblasts. This in itself created a positive opportunity to switch from the peremptory confrontation between the authors of the alternative so-called "presidential" and "parliamentary" drafts to reasoned discussion of their merits and deficiencies and to splicing together similar provisions. However, even the first plenary sitting of the Constitutional Conference with its organizational foul-up brought bitter disappointment.

Incidentally, certain mass media did not miss this opportunity to place a political "complexion" on the reason for my personal departure from the conference hall, as has become almost traditional with regard to the Constitutional Court recently.

Even for someone with a "juridical bent," there are not so much political as moral principles. And it was these (not "political support" for anyone) that did not permit me in certain circumstances to remain in an audience where undignified treatment had been meted out to people and where bodyguards had essentially staged a scuffle in which a people's deputy and the Russian general prosecutor suffered.

Or take another example: The decree, adopted within a purely constitutional framework, on the well-known decisions of the Mordovian parliament and the Chelyabinsk Oblast Soviet, in which we merely clarified the question of the powers of the legislative and representative branch of a component within the Russian Federation stipulated by the fundamental law and the Federation Treaty, has been assessed by certain commentators as virtually a sign of "disintegration" or as "incitement" to war... You get the impression that the court has now been accused of inflaming every conflict, with the possible exception of the intensified tension in the North Caucasus. Let this remain on the conscience of the commentators who would very much like to drag even constitutional justices into political games.

As for the Constitutional Conference itself, the members of the Constitutional Court, as I have already said, are taking part in it with specific proposals regarding the draft. Naturally, we will all be happy if the process of discussion, despite the problems of the first day ("practice makes perfect"), leads to mutual understanding. And, most importantly of all, if it promotes the aim for which the representatives of multinational Russia, which is awaiting clarity with regard to its future with such patience and hope, have assembled for a kind of "round-table" in the Kremlin.

Court Seeks Protection of Presidential Guard

PM1006161193 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 9 Jun 93 p 1

[Sergey Ovsiyenko report: "Who Will Guard the Constitutional Court? Supreme Judicial Organs Have Been Left Unprotected. Whose Fault Is This?"]

[Text] Protection of the Constitutional Court building and of the court's judges and the chairman himself was terminated as of 5 June. Some people are not averse to attributing a political meaning to this fact, although there is no fatal invasion of the "constitutional field" here.

I will remind readers that, prior to August 1992, the president and other top officials were guarded by a special subdivision of the Russian Ministry of Internal Affairs, and subsequently by the newly created Main Protection Administration [MPA]. On the basis of a request from Valeriy Zorkin, set out in a letter to the president, the MPA took the Constitutional Court under its wing, along with other top federal organs. But the Supreme Soviet decided that each organ of power needed its own security setup. Hence the law on the protection of the supreme federal organs. No sooner did this law start to be implemented than the question of the creation of "parliamentary" control of security was raised. The Constitutional Court was also supposed to come under its wing. But this did not happen, and V. Zorkin and his court colleagues have been left without protection, although by law they have the right to set up their own.

The Constitutional Court's press service has announced that consultations with the president's administration on this problem will last until 10 June. Incidentally, V. Zorkin, V. Yakovlev, and V. Lebedev, chairman of the Supreme Arbitration Court, have applied to the same place with a request for courts to continue to be protected by the MPA. This is understandable: The MPA employs professionals with great experience of security

work. It is simpler and more reliable to be served by the president's guard than to establish their own service.

Alleged Excerpts From Yeltsin Team Meeting

PM1106131193 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jun 93 p 2

[Boris Slavin report: "Look, the Emperor Has No Clothes On!"]

[Text] Before you, readers, is an ordinary document, offering an insight into the political kitchen of the country's present supreme leadership. It covers two routine topics: The preparation for the famous meeting with representatives of culture and art in the Bolshoy Theater's Beethoven Hall, and a discussion in the wake of that meeting of immediate political actions by the president's team in connection with a possible speech by [Vice President] A. Rutskoy in the Supreme Soviet and the activity of the Constitutional Court. Just two topics, but they are so meaningful that you want to shout out: Look, the emperor has no clothes on!

13 March. Meeting at Filatov's office.

Present: Burbulis, Shumeyko, Makarov, Krasavchenko, and Yakunin. The question being discussed concerns the composition of participants in B.N. Yeltsin's forthcoming 15 March meeting with representatives of the cultural and creative intelligentsia. Transcript (excerpts):

Burbulis: Why representatives of culture? Just the creative intelligentsia. Invite only masters, famous ones. We should not invite young people, not even "stars." Why? We have begun to issue significantly higher life pensions. Those who have not yet received them are expecting and hoping that we will make them into leading lights. This is our base, not young people. Many of them are annoyed by this.

Makarov: The Bolshoy has a smallish hall, a really nice one—the Beethoven Hall.

Filatov: Fine, we will say that there was not enough room for everyone. Which of our people will be there? Let us think. I will consult Boris Nikolayevich.

A brief conference (lasting approximately 35-40 minutes) was held in the hall, outside "Stalin's" box, immediately following the meeting with writers, artists, and composers. Present: B.N. [Yeltsin], Shumeyko, Filatov, Burbulis, Sliva, Barsukov, and Korzhakov. Excerpts from their conversation:

B.N.: Well, how are things?

Shumeyko: As they should be!

Filatov: Fine, fine, Boris Nikolayevich!

Burbulis: Perhaps we should now bring in other people through them. What about a mass concert, perhaps even in Red Square?

B.N. So be it. That's that. I am going to Vladimir. What do you expect to happen here?

Sliva: Boris Nikolayevich, it cannot be ruled out that Aleksandr Vladimirovich [Rutskoy] will address the [Supreme] Soviet tomorrow. Anything can be expected.

B.N.: So what are you there for? Neutralize him.

Barsukov: But Zorkin and other judges are expected to be present.

B.N.: What do they want? What, are they with him too?

Barsukov: We should check. So, who knows the situation at Court, or, to be more exact, within the Court?

Filatov: I met with Ametistov. He is one of ours. Morshchakova is vacillating. Kononov too, but it seems he is ill at the moment, but will soon hit out through KURANTY.

B.N.: KURANTY—KURANTY is rubbish, it is a Moscow paper.

Barsukov: Opposition to Zorkin is growing in the Court, and that is the main thing. We can rely on Oleynik, Kononov is yet to be checked out, although he is a left-winger. We should support the confrontation between Zorkin and Vitruk. And think about Seleznev.

B.N.: Well? What else?

Sliva: Zorkin has two weaknesses. He is in no way an apparatchik. That is one. He has no think tank—that is two.

Barsukov: There are many casual individuals around him. Perhaps that is important. And we can say—that makes three weaknesses. According to our information, Gurevich has been successfully neutralized. At any rate, Zorkin has stopped consulting him on cadre matters.

B.N.: And who is he?

Sliva: The deputy of Kudryatsev's son. But close to Zorkin, I have known him for a long time. He is not so straightforward. He worked under Khasbulatov.

Filatov: I recall him, but he is a conservative.

Sliva: But he would be useful to us from a practical point of view. He sticks to the law. But how? After all, he told me himself that he joined the Court because of Zorkin's personality. On the whole, he is an idealist, albeit a fervent parliamentarian, but he could be useful to us. We could winkle him out of there...

Filatov: Maybe we can think of some post in the government apparatus to offer him—the Ministry of Justice needs people. And he gets on with the deputies...

B.N.: Decide, decide, you are all too slow. If something can be done on the inside, if someone can be won over to us—act. But the main thing now is Rutskoy, not Zorkin.

Filatov: But Makarov will speak in Leningrad [as published] tomorrow about Zorkin. Maybe, afterward we should let him speak on the Moscow channel too?

B.N.: Why not, that is not a bad idea at all. Let lawyer cut lawyer. And let Yegor [Gaydar], Chubays, and Grachev attack Rutskoy. Yes?

Korzhakov. It is time, Boris Nikolayevich.

B.N.: Well. that is all, let us go.

Various documents and materials about the activity of the highest functionaries of the state power come into PRAVDA's hands. Some arrive haphazardly, others are sent by courier. Their authenticity is often confirmed. The document which we publish today has also been confirmed in practice. Indeed, only the "leading lights" of literature and art, as "planned" by Burbulis, were present in the Beethoven Hall, and they truly earned their pensions: We have not seen such toadyism to the president since Stalin's times.

In line with S. Filatov's instructions, Makarov indeed spoke against Zorkin, accusing the latter of immaturity and political chicanery. Finally, on 8 July, [as published] fulfilling his "high" instructions and earning the apartments given by City Hall, Constitutional Court Deputy Chairman Vitruk "fired his shot," demanding Zorkin's resignation and blackmailing public opinion with his own resignation. As is well known, Yegor Gaydar, Chubays, and Grachev also played their parts.

I think that this document dispels the myth being spread by the press about the good tsar and the bad boyars. They are all in it together. And while we have such a power in our country, we will have neither bread, nor morals, nor peace.

Military Issues

Officers' Gathering Continues in Moscow

Grachev Wants More Contract Recruitment

PM1106075193 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 2000 GMT 9 Jun 93

[Report by A. Ilin and O. Nikiforov; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] [Ilin] For the first time since the creation of the Russian Army, the General Staff has organized assemblies of Armed Forces command personnel at the Taman Division base. Among the main reasons for holding these meetings, Pavel Grachev highlighted the incipient transition to recruitment on a contract basis, under which over 100,000 people have already been enlisted.

[Defense Minister Pavel Grachev] We will be asking the government and the Supreme Soviet to allocate an additional 50,000 [not further specified] at least for contract service.

[Ilin] However, this will only help to lessen the overall manpower deficit in the Armed Forces by seven percent. Military experts forecast that by the year 2000 some 50 percent of enlisted men and NCO's in the Russian Army will be hired on a contract basis.

At times the military reforms throw up some pleasant surprises: There have been instances recently of contracts being signed by entire families.

Boris Yeltsin is expected to address the command staff today.

Yeltsin Speech Published

PM1006185093 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Jun 93 pp 1, 3

[Report by Captain 1st Rank V. Chupakhin and Lieutenant Colonel A. Dokuchayev: "Army Has Passed Tests and Is Capable of Launching Full-Scale Reform. Russian President B.N. Yeltsin Addressed Participants in Operational Courses for Armed Forces Leadership Personnel"]

[Text] The operational courses for Russian Federation Armed Forces leadership personnel have ended in Moscow. They were notable for the fact that leaders of the Defense Ministry, General Staff, and main and central directorates, and command personnel of branches and categories of the Armed Forces, military districts, groups of forces, and fleets were directly involved in a series of practical and demonstration studies on questions of combat readiness and the organization of the troops' day-to-day activity. The operational courses for leadership personnel served as a kind of forum for summing up the results of the first year of building the Armed Forces.

The main result, as Russian Federation Defense Minister Army General Pavel Grachev noted at the opening of the third and final day of work at the operational courses, is that Russia's Army is now combat-capable and under reliable control, and is a guarantor of stability in our state and a guarantor of strategic security in the world.

A report on the results of the winter training period was delivered at the operational courses by Colonel General Mikhail Kolesnikov, chief of the Russian Federation Armed Forces General Staff. He noted that on the whole the units and formations fulfilled their combat training plans. The majority of the units tested were given positive assessments. At the same time the report was critical of the shortcomings that exist in combat training. Col.Gen. Kolesnikov also analyzed other aspects of the activity of leadership personnel, designed to increasing combat and mobilization readiness.

Boris Yeltsin, president of the Russian Federation, addressed the participants in the courses.

I have meetings fairly regularly with Armed Forces leaders and servicemen, B.N. Yeltsin stressed. I consider

it one of my prime duties to keep up to date with the complex problems that the Army is experiencing and to help to tackle them.

For my part, I would like to thank you and all Armed Forces personnel for your service over the past year. This was one of the most difficult years in history for the Russian Army, which goes back for centuries.

The military has passed this test with honor. It is symbolic, B.N. Yeltsin noted, that our combat newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA has also withstood tests, and has now become much better and more interesting than before. The Armed Forces suffered a great deal during the period of disintegration of the single military organism that became inevitable in late 1991. For people who had devoted their lives to the profession of defending the Motherland, that blow was extremely severe, and undeniably led to an acute psychological crisis.

It must be admitted, the president said, that at first we underestimated the strength of the former union republics' striving for independence and even for mutual alienation. There was hope of preserving a unified armed forces, and, as you know, we did everything possible. Life revealed that in the end the choice had to be made in favor of a Russian Army. And that choice was made. I believe that this was what helped us to preserve not only a combat-capable Army, but—I can say this without exaggeration—the peaceful course of life in Russia itself.

It would not have been possible to implement the decision to create a Russian Army had it not been for the clear, patriotic stance of the majority of the military leadership, generals, and officers. You know that Russia inherited an extremely disorganized army structure. The first strategic echelon was left outside Russia. The state of the Armed Forces bore the imprint of the ignominious Afghan adventure into which they were drawn. The heavy burden of making provision for the formations and units that were being withdrawn from the countries of Eastern Europe fell on Russia's shoulders.

Mention must also be made of the commercialization of the Armed Forces, which by then had assumed threatening proportions, and of the unprecedented extent of nonregulation relations.

The list of the Army's problems could be continued indefinitely, but they all led to the same conclusion: It was necessary to put an end to the uncertainty, create the Russian Armed Forces, and step up military reform. I am saying this because in order objectively to assess what has been done, it is necessary to see where the starting point was.

Over the past year, through a colossal intensity of effort, much has been done. The Army has passed the low point of the crisis. In general, the main guidelines for Armed Forces building have been defined. With the Defense Ministry's active participation, a number of legislative enactments on military issues have been drawn up and adopted. They include the Laws "on Defense," "on Security," "on the Status of Servicemen," "on Military Obligation and Military Service," "on Pension Provision for Persons Who Have Carried Out Military Service and Service in the Internal Affairs Organs and Their Families," and others. Drafts have been drawn up of the Fundamentals of Military Doctrine and the Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation.

In the main, operational planning has been completed. Strategic planning documents are being drafted. Groupings of troops in the most important strategic salients, in particular the North Caucasus and Moscow Military Districts, have been strengthened. At the same time the authorized strength is being reduced—by nearly 300,000 servicemen by the end of 1993.

The drafting of the plan for the use [plan primeneniya] of the Armed Forces must be completed, for submission to the president by September. I hope you will keep to that schedule for drawing it up.

The main guarantor of Russia's security and a key factor in maintaining military-strategic stability in the world is the strategic nuclear forces. Today we have conceptual approaches to Russia's nuclear policy. The building and combat activity of the strategic nuclear forces takes place on the basis of those approaches.

Russia continues to follow the Soviet Union's commitments on limiting and reducing strategic nuclear arms. A treaty on further significant reductions of these arms has been signed with the United States. An agreement has been concluded with the Republic of Belarus on the transfer of formations and units of strategic nuclear forces on its territory to Russia's jurisdiction. Important steps have been taken toward the conclusion of corresponding agreements with Ukraine and Kazakhstan.

The initial results can now be summed up. The main thing, in my view, is that over the past year it has been possible to restore the system of control of the Russian Armed Forces. That is the main thing.

Another, perhaps even more important, result is that to a significant degree we have been able to overcome the dangerous symptoms of demoralization among personnel, above all among the officers.

The moral and psychological climate among the troops is improving perceptibly. I consider it important that the attitude to the Army in Russian society is changing markedly. Public opinion today rejects a disparagingly arrogant attitude toward the military. Perhaps for the first time in many years, it sees the soldier and officer above all as a person, and moreover takes him under its protection. Assessments of Army life today contain considerably more understanding, sympathy, and support.

Today, B.N. Yeltsin stressed, we have reason to say that the Armed Forces are fulfilling their tasks, are capable of defending Russia against encroachments from outside,

and can serve as a reliable guarantor of peace and stability within the country.

In the past year we have succeeded in safeguarding the Russian Army. Now we must launch full-bodied, large-scale military reform. I hope the Russian Armed Forces leadership shares that approach.

The General Staff, the main staffs of the branches of the Armed Forces, the staffs of categories of troops, and the Defense Ministry main directorates have appropriate plans for the period through the end of 1995. The task now is to ensure their strict fulfillment.

Russia inherited from the USSR a part of the Armed Forces which did not constitute a single, integral structure. It consisted primarily of forces of the second strategic echelon. Those that were most combat-capable and equipped with sophisticated armaments were in other states. Systems relating to communications, troop control, intelligence, missile attack warning, air defense, and vital supplies were disrupted.

That is why it is not enough today simply to keep military facilities in working order. It is necessary to reconstruct and to build important new facilities which will affect the Army's combat readiness.

Of course, a serious problem, B.N. Yeltsin noted, is the financing of the troops. In the budget for this year, 3.5 trillion rubles [R] was allocated to the Armed Forces. Taking inflation into account, after the defense minister's letter in May I gave instructions, and this sum was recalculated: Taking into account the inflation coefficient, as of today it is R5.35 trillion. True, there has been a certain lag in financing. But measures are being taken, and the necessary funds will be allocated, the president stressed.

The current task is a major structural reorganization of Russia's Armed Forces. This is a statewide task for us. New approaches to the structure of the groupings of troops are needed today. We cannot economically permit ourselves to create strong groupings along the entire border. That principle is obsolete. It is first and foremost a question of creating mobile forces which are capable if necessary of being shipped to any region of the country in the shortest amount of time.

By 1995 the strength of the Armed Forces is to be 1.5 million. And it is necessary to switch not in theory, but in practice to the mixed manning principle (by drafting and by voluntary enlistment under contract).

The number of people accepted for military service under contract has already passed the 100,000 mark this year. I know recruitment went pretty well. Indeed, there was even competition to fill the vacancies.

I believe the fullest possible use should be made of this experience. Those who join the Army under contract should be the best people in every respect. The tougher the selection process and the higher the level of competition, the better it will be for Russia itself and for the Armed Forces. And here, in particular, imaginative television publicity for military service would do no harm. You have thus far been timid about using this medium.

One of the most complex problems, B.N. Yeltsin noted, is the withdrawal of Russian troops from the territories of a number of distant and nearby foreign states. No state in the world has tackled such a problem, and frankly it has proved extremely difficult for Russia.

By the end of 1994 it is planned to withdraw more than 170,000 servicemen, about 1,700 tanks, more than 2,000 artillery systems, and about 540 planes and helicopters. On the whole we are succeeding in maintaining control over the withdrawal of troops and sticking to schedules. But all the same, the main thing is the stationing of the withdrawn troops on Russia's territory and the provision of facilities for them. The draft of a state program on this matter is with the government. It should be examined and adopted in the near future. But the main thing is to ensure its strict fulfillment.

A program of state measures to strengthen social protection for servicemen, persons discharged from military service, and their families in the context of economic and military reform was approved 27 March. I believe that much is being done in this sphere in today's complex conditions. And that is only right.

At the same time, B.N. Yeltsin stressed, the inflation factor cannot be disregarded. We will monitor this carefully and raise the benchmark for servicemen's pay in good time. We will have to return to this again this year, perhaps even twice. Servicemen must be assured that they and their families will not be hard done by.

Many problems have arisen in the Armed Forces due to objective factors. But unfortunately by no means everything possible was done in the past year by the Defense Ministry. I will dwell on just a few things.

The question of strengthening military discipline is being dealt with extremely slowly. In the first year of the Russian Federation Armed Forces' existence, 7,000 people were convicted of various crimes. The number of cases of evasion of military service, including absence from the unit without leave, has increased.

There is no decline in the number of disasters and accidents to planes and helicopters, warships and auxiliary vessels, and motor and armored vehicles. Thefts and losses of weapons continue. The steadily increasing rate of encroachments on state interests is alarming. First among the reasons for this phenomenon are greed and the desire to get rich. There is a continuing increase in particularly large-scale thefts, the material damage from which, in the current year, has totaled more than R1 billion. Instances of servicemen's involvement in the smuggling of nonferrous metals and other materials and raw materials subject to licensing are still widespread.

Officials holding high positions in the Armed Forces are increasingly frequently falling within the sphere of activity of the law enforcement organs. I do not want to list the generals' names. But I think the most serious conclusions should be drawn from each such incident.

I think it is clear to all of us, B.N. Yeltsin noted, that the very difficult processes of formation of Russia's Armed Forces can lead to positive results only in conditions of stability.

The 25 April referendum clearly demonstrated the positions held by the majority of Russia's politically active population; namely, support for our course of transformations. I am aware of and appreciate highly the fact that Army personnel unequivocally supported this course in the referendum.

The referendum confirmed what was already obvious to many of us. A significant majority of the country's population is in favor of a peaceful, civilized path of development. The path of revolutionary upheavals and violence does not and will not find support.

Since 25 April the desire of various political forces for compromise has become particularly obvious. This is also demonstrated by the Constitutional Conference, which has brought together people of various convictions and political stances. Shared constructive work has united those who, in different conditions, would have been on opposite sides of the barricades.

I do not think this is accidental. For the past few months we were literally poised on the brink. Tension was increasing in the relationship between the federal authorities, the trend toward territorial separatism was growing stronger, and political confrontation was flaring up in the streets. All this prolonged the economic crisis and exacerbated the situation of the ordinary citizen.

The attempts by many unscrupulous figures to drag the Army into political games were particularly dangerous. To their credit, the vast majority of soldiers and officers remained loyal to their professional duty and the people of Russia.

Our principled position was and remains the following: The Armed Forces must be outside parties, outside the political struggle. But that certainly does not mean some kind of opposition to the policy pursued by the state. On the country, it is your clear duty and mine to follow the course chosen by the people.

The Army today is not only the guarantor of the country's security. It is called upon to be the guarantor of stability, the guarantor of economic and political reforms in Russia.

It is important for us to strengthen to the utmost the trend toward consensus that has emerged, to reject the crude confrontation that is still being foisted on society from the most extreme political flanks. I hope, B.N. Yeltsin said, that we are allies in this cause.

In conclusion the president wished those present success, and assured them that for him the affairs of Russia's Armed Forces will always be an area of special attention and involvement.

On the final day of the courses the participants heard a number of speeches, including a speech by S. Stepashin, chairman of the parliamentary Committee on Defense Questions. The results of the courses were summed up by Russian Federation Defense Minister Army Gen. P. Grachev. He gave concrete instructions for the summer training period. The courses ended not entirely conventionally. The Armed Forces leadership personnel saw a performance by young artists participating in the "New Names" international charity program, who performed works of classical music and jazz. They were received very warmly by those present.

Yeltsin Speaks at Promotion Ceremony for Senior Officers

LD1106112893 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1000 GMT 11 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Andrey Naryshkin and Gennadiy Talalayev]

[Text] Moscow, 11 Jun—The Russian president, who is supreme commander in chief of the Armed Forces, today presented 80 senior Army and Navy officers with their first general's stars. Under the president's decree of 9 June, they have all been promoted to major general or rear admiral.

Addressing the officers, Boris Yeltsin stressed: "In a complex and fast-changing situation, Russia's Armed Forces and the corps of officers are displaying calm, restraint, and cohesion. Work is in progress to strengthen the combat might of the Armed Forces. The foundations of a new, professional army have been laid. We have no intention of attacking anybody. Our military doctrine, work on which is nearly complete, is defensive. But this does not mean that we can relax our vigilance or the level of our combat readiness. On the contrary, our Army and Navy will respond to their lofty calling of repelling aggression in all circumstances, from any direction, no matter where it may come from."

Recalling that the rank of general was first introduced to the Russian Army 350 years ago, Boris Yeltsin hoped that the military chiefs will be worthy of the combat glory earned by commanders whose names have been recorded forever in the history of the Russian state.

The ceremony, which took place in St. Vladimir's hall of the Grand Kremlin Palace, was also attended by Army General Pavel Grachev, Russia's defense minister, his deputies, and commanders of the various branches of the Russian Federation's Armed Forces.

Media & Economic Issues

Minister on Media Control Legislation

OW1006092193 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel and Orbita Networks in Russian 1845 GMT 26 May 93

[Studio interview with Mikhail Aleksandrovich Fedotov, minister of press and information, by Aleksandr Panov; from the "Utro" program—live]

[Text] [Panov] Yesterday the Constitutional Court finished hearings on freedom of the press in state television and radio broadcasting, and other mass media. As you know, this occurred because of a petition submitted by a group of people's deputies implementing a decision by the last Congress, which had resolved to introduce Observation Councils in television and other means of the mass media, is that not correct Mikhail Aleksandrovich?

[Fedotov] Yes, television, radio, and information services, although to tell the truth it is not quite clear what is meant by information services—perhaps they meant state information.

[Panov] Our guest today is Mikhail Aleksandrovich Fedotov, the minister of press and information of the Russian Federation, the man who appeared for the petitioning side at these hearings, and who is one of the authors of the current law on the press. This morning the Court is due to hand down its decision, so we assume that while our program is being broadcast during the morning hours that this decision will have already been made. That is why most probably I can ask your opinions and assessments on this matter, concerning this process, without being accused of exerting pressure on the decision of the Court.

[Fedotov] Not at all, I am certain that the decision has already been made and today at 0930 [0530 GMT] we will know what it is. I expect that the decision will come down in favor of the constitution, the law, and freedom of speech. In this case, one need not have any doubts whatsoever that our television and radio will remain free and independent. However, at the same time, this will mean that we must realize the president's 20 March edict instructing that draft laws be formulated for state, public, and private television and radio broadcasting, and so on. I am convinced that this process was, in essence, a process for defending the freedom of speech on television, though representatives from both sides talked about freedom of speech.

[Panov] Here is the international charter on freedom of the press. [Panov shows a pamphlet with "Charter of the Freedom of the Press" in Russian and a logo on the cover]

[Fedotov] This is applicable to television as well.

[Panov] It would be splendid if everyone always adhered to it, however, where the essence of the problem probably lies is in the fact that this is not just a simple political struggle going on in this country, and it splashes out onto the pages of the newspapers and television screens. While there are a large number of printed publications and newspapers with their varying opinions covering almost the entire spectrum of judgments and assessments by various parties, television is less diversified—there is only the Ostankino Television Company. The very delicate issue of air time, giving one or another party the opportunity to speak, arises. Perhaps a special law for television could be the solution to this problem. What are the prospects for such a law, and as an experienced lawyer are you taking part in its creation?

[Fedotov] Yes, I took part in the creation of this draft law, and in fact criticized it frightfully, because I did not like the draft that was prepared, however, I am prepared to carry out the president's edict and take a most active part in the creation of this draft law. I consider it necessary, and I know how it can be formulated so that it will satisfy both sides, since in essence we have two sides here. One side is the television viewer and the other is the television journalist. However, I am still quite far from discussing the sharing of air time between political parties or social movements. How many parties do we have at present—70 in my estimation? It is simply unrealistic to divide air time among them. There is no need to politicize television, on the contrary, it should be politicized as little as possible, because our viewer is primarily interested in news, good entertainment, and sports programs. He is not interested at all—in any case not to a very high degree—in political debates where various political parties are introduced. After all, there are newspapers which can be read.

[Panov] I can only agree with that, however, on the other hand allow me to recall an anecdote, attributed to Yuriy Vladimirovich Nikulin, which I recently read in the paper: Two grannies meet at Easter time, and one says to the other, "Christ has risen, Ilinichna", and the other replies, "Yes, yes, no, yes". [Fedotov laughs; reference is to referendum responses of Yeltsin supporters]

This is on the issue of how television should, and how it will be politicized, the issue of arrangements...

[Fedotov, interrupting] What makes you think that this is the influence of television, maybe it is the influence of leaflets or newspapers. If you recall that some newspapers published during the run up to the referendum were simply continuous proclamations.

[Panov] Perhaps I am simply remembering a film where kids in a kindergarten sounded out, yes, yes, no, yes!

[Fedotov] I have seen this film and others and I can tell you that in many countries political advertising on television is completely forbidden, and this is clearly a form of a political advertisement. We must learn to live as they do in civilized society.

This is perhaps the first time that we have used television for political advertising in a run up to the referendum. So, let us agree that we will not do that anymore. Let us develop other, more civilized standards for the use of television in pre-election and pre-referendum campaigns.

[Panov] I think that many television viewers would agree with that.

[Fedotov] I hope so, and I believe that in many countries there are special standards in regards to use of television and radio specifically at such acute political times, that is, in pre-election and pre-referendum campaigns. At other times, parties only have minimal television and radio air time, and television journalists have the maximum.

You know, a very interesting situation arose during this process. All sides, our opponents, ourselves, and the experts all expressed the opinion that television should be controlled by an independent, nonstate, highly prestigious body. The only difference was that our opponents were saying that this is the very Observation Council, which institutes the congress of people's deputies—I draw your attention to an interesting detail here, it is called the Federal Observation Council, that is, abbreviated it becomes FNS [Federalnyy Nablyudatelnyy Sovet], but we already have one FNS—so they envisaged this Federal Observation Council as the independent, nonstate, and highly prestigious body. But there is nothing of this sort in the decree of the congress. This is a body formed by the Supreme Soviet from deputy factions, and we know the relationships between the deputy factions, so this body would be particularly politicized, and there is not one word that a really highly prestigious, highly moral, independent, and apolitical people should be encouraged in to this body.

[Panov] I am sure that no one would argue against this if the Observation Councils were to be made up of prestigious people who would use only one criteria—whether a production is a quality one or not.

[Fedotov] Yes, for instance, the first name that comes to mind when I think about such an Observation Council is Dmitriy Sergeyevich Likhachev. [video cuts to show booklet entitled, "Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Russian Federation—Russia"]

[Panov] Since we are talking about human and moral issues, I would like to ask perhaps the final question, about another issue. This question will again be a political one—it is inescapable even in a morning broadcast. I am taking advantage of the opportunity to ask a painful question—seeing that our guest is a minister and a member of the Cabinet of Ministers, and not only a minister but a man who sings songs and composes poetry, that is, a humane and intelligent person—although unfortunately for many this is still a swear word. I would like to ask you about the decision to free prices on oil and fuel. Understandably, this decision was an objective one and is dictated by the necessity of the general economic situation, but nevertheless, does it not seem to you more honest and moral to free prices before the referendum and not after?

[Fedotov] You know, although I am a member of the government, this presidential decree was absolute news to me. I think that it would have been of the utmost importance to explain to people what is involved, explain why it must done right now and not later—like after the harvesting period for example. Why could not this be explained to the people, showing them reasons and the real state of affairs. I consider that our responsible leaders, concerned with fuel and energy issues, should now come here to your television station without you having to invite them...

[Panov interrupting] And given that information, we would have invited them. As soon as that decision became known, we tried to contact them, though as you know there is no official commentary forthcoming—so far.

[Fedotov] Regretfully, and the Ministry of Press was not in anyway involved in this work, although I am certain that we could have helped. I am sure that perhaps if not today then tomorrow, and maybe even today, people in the government responsible for the fuel and energy complex will come here, explain and clarify everything because the situation is causing bewilderment. I will tell you honestly that I was greatly amazed when I found out about this presidential edict. Of course, this should not have been done in this way before the referendum ...

[Panov, interrupting] Free and freeze...

[Fedotov] ... first to free, then later freeze the prices literally after a few days, and now when the referendum is finished again free them. There is an element of a lack of political understanding here, simply an absence of perhaps political sensitivity and tact. This lack of information always gives birth to myths, it gives birth to doubts in sincerity, doubts of whether you are being deceived. So, the more information and the more responsible and prestigious person who imparts this information, the higher the level of understanding, mutual understanding, between authority...

[Panov, interrupting] ...yes, mutual understanding in society. Perhaps we can conclude at this point, unfortunately time for our morning chat is not unlimited, thank you very much for coming.

[Fedotov] I am off to the Constitutional Court.

[Panov] I wish you every success. Our guest was Mikhail Aleksandrovich Fedotov, Minister of Information and Press of the Russian Federation. Thank you.

[Fedotov] Thank you.

Both Sides 'Satisfied' With Freedom of Speech Verdict

PM1006141193 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 29 May 93 First Edition p 3

[Commentary by Aleksey Vorobyev under the "Constitutional Court" rubric: "The Debate on Freedom of Speech Will Go On Forever"]

[Text] The 27 May Constitutional Court session issued its decision on the request by a group of people's deputies to examine the constitutionality of the Ninth Congress of People's Deputies Resolution "On Measures to Safeguard Freedom of Speech in State Television and Radio Broadcasting and in Information Services."

The court said that the Congress decisions revoking the presidential edicts "On the 'Rossiya' Federal Television and Radio Broadcasting Service" and "On the Russian Federal Information Center" and the organizations referred to in them are, in fact, legal.

The court dropped proceedings relating to Clause 3 of the Congress resolution, which sets up supervisory councils to safeguard freedom of speech in state television and radio broadcasting, because, in the judges' opinion, this clause has no real legal substance and will have no legal consequences.

Four clauses of the resolution—which regulate the activity of television and radio broadcasting companies and lay down that representative power bodies have the right to act as cofounders of these companies together with executive power structures and that the appointment of their leaders must be coordinated with the Federal Supervisory Council—were deemed by the court to be in compliance with the Constitution with regard to form and content and from the viewpoint of the separation of powers. However, these same clauses were deemed unconstitutional because of the procedure followed in their adoption and publication, so the court declared them null and void.

So, the supreme constitutional arbiter has confirmed as lawful the abolition of the notorious Federal Information Center, whose leadership has recently tried so actively to impose its political bias on many of the mass media and engaged in activity which directly infringes press freedom. The constitutional judges also agreed with the Ninth Congress decision to somehow balance the influence of various power structures on television and radio broadcasting and prevent their being monopolized by one political force.

The way in which this decision was adopted, drawn up, and published is another matter. The petition indicates that the Congress violated the procedure for voting on the amendments and on the resolution as a whole. Moreover, the plaintiffs stressed that comparison of the text adopted by the Congress and that published in ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA gives grounds for claiming that changes going far beyond mere editing were made to several clauses after the Congress. The court found these objections valid and sent the relevant representation to the Russian Supreme Soviet Presidium regarding violations of rules of procedure.

It may be paradoxical, but it is a fact that both the plaintiffs and the respondents in this case are satisfied with the outcome of the very prolonged law suit. Deputy Oleg Plotnikov, who defended the interests of the representative power, considers it fundamentally important that the actual contents of the resolution are deemed constitutional, as this will make it possible to use the contents of Congress decisions in other, newly prepared legal acts which the Supreme Soviet could adopt in the future.

In other words, the stand taken by the representative power is perfectly legal; it just has to know how to avoid legal errors in its presentation.

"I believe that we have defended freedom of speech on radio and television," Minister of Information and the Press Mikhail Fedotov, who represented the plaintiffs, said. "Although the struggle for influence on the press will of course continue. The Supreme Soviet will certainly try to change the Law on the Mass Media and, relying on its own powers, will nevertheless start to form a federal supervisory council. This will be a long job, however, because, when changing a law, you have to link it up to the rest of the legal system. This requires a careful, very cautious approach."

Such rare unanimity between opponents in our society, which is rent by political passions, could only be welcomed if it were not based on two totally different interpretations of freedom of speech.

Justice Ministry Loses Lawsuit Against DEN

LD1006192493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1832 GMT 10 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tamara Ivanova]

[Text] Moscow June 10 TASS—A Moscow court rejected on Thursday [10 June] a lawsuit filed by the Russian Justice Ministry against the hard-line "DEN" daily and demanding to close the publication for "active actions calling to change the constitutional system, for propaganda of war and social strife".

Supporters of the "DEN" welcomed the decision by a storm of applause glorifying the editor-in-chief.

Experts of the ministry believe the court rejected the lawsuit because the propaganda of war and calls to overthrow the existing state system are a state crime and cannot be considered by a common court.

The "social strife" notion has not been defined by legislators and without such a definition the consideration of the case would be a "competition of lawyers", they said.

Earlier another Moscow court turned down a similar lawsuit filed by the Justice Ministry against another hard-line newspaper "SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA". However, the court made a warning to the newspaper and information Minister Mikhail Fedotov believes it played its role. Articles now published in the daily are in the framework of the legal norms, he said.

'RTV-Press' Evicted by Yeltsin 'Protege' Bragin

PM1106104993 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 10 Jun 93 First Edition p 3

[Irina Mezentseva report: "Scandal: Vyacheslav Bragin Twists Yegor Yakovlev's Arm"]

[Text] Personnel from the RTV-Press Joint-Stock Company spent the whole working day 8 June on the street. The building housing the company was so heavily guarded by militia that people could not even enter the courtyard.

The action to capture the building began on 5 June. First, according to RTV-Press Chief Editor Tatyana Menshikova, a strange man telephoned the Vnukovo Airport deputies' hall and made sure that Yakovlev had flown to Sochi for the "Kinotavr" movie festival. Shortly afterwards 15 armed militia personnel from the "Ostankino" television and radio company guard department came to No. 1. Volodarskiy Street and sealed off all entrances to the building.

There has been no court ruling for RTV-Press to be evicted. The court of arbitration ruling deeming the flotation of RTV-Press property illegal has not yet come into force. What is more, the city prosecutor and the head of the Moscow Internal Affairs Main Administration have issued a joint order barring militia personnel from interfering in property disputes between organizations.

Four RTV-Press personnel have voluntarily remained in the building since 5 June with a view to protecting the agency's property. They have been speaking to their colleagues through the courtyard fence.

This extremely unpleasant scene has been organized by Vyacheslav Bragin, the protege of Boris Yeltsin and Mikhail Poltoranin, now head of the "Ostankino" Russian State Television and Radio Company.

So, force and weapons are increasingly frequently the arguments used by present-day politicians in the president's entourage. Indeed, how could Bragin fail to follow the example of his big boss, in whose presence the presidential guard twisted the arm of the general prosecutor and a deputy?

Roundtable Mulls Economic Accord Declaration

MK1006111693 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 10 Jun 93 p 2

[Anna Ostapchuk report under the "Drafts" rubric: "Declaration of Accord on the 'Roundtable'"]

[Text] The presentation of the draft "Declaration of National Economic Accord" took place at a regular meeting of the "roundtable" set up by the 11 January 1993 order of the Russian Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Russian Federation Government.

The meeting was attended by Supreme Soviet Deputy Chairmen Yuriy Voronin and Vladimir Ispravnikov, while the Russian Government was represented by First Deputy Prime Minister Oleg Lobov and Deputy Finance Minister Sergey Gorbachev, and the Central Bank by Deputy Chairman Aleksandr Khandruyev.

To all appearances, the reason the draft produced a favorable impression is that it was not politicians, but scientists from leading economic institutes, who were tasked with preparing it. The declaration was drafted by, among others, Yevgeniy Saburov, Yuriy Yeremenko, and Ivan Ivanov.

The drafters were guided by the principle that the problems, solutions to which may prove unacceptable to any of the participants of the "roundtable," should not be touched upon at all. The 10-page document includes, among other things, a section entitled "Key Areas of Economic Reform in Russia," the underlying thesis of which is the unanimity of the "roundtable" participants in aiming at the creation of a market-driven economy, albeit a "socially oriented" and mixed one based on the diversity of forms of ownership and business practice.

The draft also states that special agreements (all-Russian solidarity pacts) between the key players of the reform process, such as the federal government authorities, Federation components, trade unions, and associations of entrepreneurs, may produce a positive result with regard to the achievement of national accord. Mentioned among such agreements are the "Accord on the Reform Program;" agreements on maintaining the unity of Russia; on regulating prices and incomes, budget and currency agreements; and an agreement on investment promotion. The declaration also includes a package of agreements aimed at stabilizing living standards.

Separately, a mechanism for the implementation of the declaration will be worked out. Iosif Diskin, an expert from Civic Union, told your NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA correspondent that this document (after it is finalized) would have to signed by the main holders [derzhateli] of economic and political resources. Afterward, the signing of "internal" agreements pertaining to the declaration would commence. At the final stage, the document will evidently be signed by the president, the Supreme Soviet chairman, and the Russian prime minister.

Lobov Comments on Joint Enterprises Oil Export Ban

LD0906223393 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1600 GMT 9 Jun 93

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] As has already been reported, the Russian pipeline transport company "Transneft" stopped the export of oil extracted and processed by joint enterprises on 1 June. The economic, social and moral damage for Russia in this situation is obvious. Our next report is from Oleg Lobov's news conference. Our correspondent Budnikov reports:

Today, when speaking at a news conference, Oleg Lobov, the minister for fuel and power engineering, touched upon the conflict connected with the work of joint enterprises. As of recently the oil extracted by them has been stopped from being exported. It became clear from the words of the minister and other officials that it is not economic sabotage on the part of the enemies of the reforms. Joint enterprises cannot export more oil than they extract. Numerous occasions were noted when the oil extracted elsewhere was being sold through them. That's why the Ministry for Fuel and Power Engineering requested that joint enterprises should provide information on the volume of their output. As soon as they provide this information, the path for their oil abroad will be open.

Paper Views New Arrangements for Land Sale, Purchase

PM0906152393 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 5 Jun 93 First Edition p 1

["Economics Section" commentary: "The Main Thing Is That There Should Be a Schedule. Government Ratifies Procedure for Buying and Selling Plots of Land"]

[Text] The document being put forward for the reader's favorable attention is the real key that fits the keyhole which was so difficult to reach: the procedure for buying and selling land. These tiny hundredths of a hectare where we can build garden houses and small sheds.

As news agencies have reported, the Russian Federation Government has ratified the procedure for Russian citizens to buy and sell plots of land for the purposes of managing a private subsidiary smallholding or dacha, for horticulture, and for individual house construction.

In accordance with this procedure, the deal between the seller and the buyer will be registered by a deed-contract of the purchase-sale. A schedule of the plot should be enclosed with the deed of purchase: Without it the deed of purchase is not subject to registration.

When the deal is concluded, its participants cannot change the specific purpose of the plot and the system for the use of the lands (sanitation-protection zones, conservation and historical-cultural lands, right of way through the plot). The price of the plot and the conditions of payment will be determined on the basis of an agreement between the buyer and the seller or on the basis of the results of a tender or auction.

The right of ownership of the plot is transferred from the seller to the buyer at the moment of registration of the notarized deed of purchase by a rayon (city) committee for land resources and land use measures. The buyer's right to ownership of the land is registered by the local administration, and he is issued with a document certifying this right.

Council of Ministers decree no. 503 dated 30 May, which ratifies the procedure for buying and selling plots of land, instructs the Russian Federation Ministry of Finance to prepare for submission to parliament, within a month, a proposal on taxation and the levying of state duties during the conclusion of deals.

Pleased that we have finally moved on from strict laws which you cannot make any real use of to routine arrangements, we put the following question to Mr. Stanislav Lipskoy, an employee of the government apparatus:

"Could you sell the plot a day later?"

"Follow the point in the document which deals with the schedule of the plot. If there is no schedule, then you cannot sell it. You have to first of all find an organization which will draw up and certify a schedule of land ownership. And then you can sell it."

We felt calmer: We have no schedule for our plot, nor do other people either. This means that the process of legal purchase-sale will not get off the ground in the near future.

But a step has nevertheless been taken. All kinds of discrepancies will obviously arise now: Who should draw up this schedule, who should sign it and certify it, and who can be trusted at all in this life. But we will definitely portray in our newspaper the first person to sell their plot according to the new procedure. This will no doubt be someone emigrating from the new democratic country who was intimidated by the excessive freedom.

Food, Other Price Increases for May Viewed

PM1006153593 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jun 93 First Edition p 4

[Report by Irina Goryacheva of Economic Situation Center under Russian Government: "Prices Increased by a Factor of 2.64 in Five Months"]

[Text] According to operational data, the overall inflation index in May stood at 119 percent, including 104 percent for the last week. Inflation in May was 2 percent higher than in March and 3 percent higher than in April. According to the running figures the inflation index for the first five months of this year stands at 264 percent.

In May the rate of increase in the prices of the 70 foodstuffs being monitored by state statistical organs outstripped the increase in the prices of nonfood commodities. On average, foods went up in price 22 percent during the month, while nonfood commodities, a limited range of which is being monitored on a systematic basis, went up 14 percent. Services for the population went up in price most of all—by 26 percent during the month.

Foodstuffs in unorganized trade—in city and informal markets—went up in price considerably more than in stores under all forms of ownership. On average, vegetables went up 70 percent in May, and fruits went up 36 percent—which can be accounted for by products of the new harvest coming on sale. Meat went up 30 percent (6 percent during the last week)—which cannot be accounted for in a similar fashion. Since the beginning of this year meat, dairy, and fish products have gone up by factor of between 3.4 and 2.6, and butter and eggs by a factor of 2.3.

The rates of increase rowth in food prices drew somewhat more level among the individual economic regions in May. In April the difference had stood at 15 percentage points, but in May it was down to nine. The Volga region, where food went up in price 26 percent last month alone, was in the lead in terms of prices growth in May, just as in April.

It is interesting that the smoothing out of differences in the rates of growth in prices among the economic regions did not affect the internal regional consumer markets, where there is still a difference among oblasts. The difference in the rates of increase in prices stands at 24 percentage points among the oblasts of the Northern economic region, 29 points in the North Caucasus region, and 34 points in the Volga region. This means that in the various oblasts of the Volga region bread prices differ by a factor of six, egg prices by a factor of four, and the prices of other products by a factor of almost two.

Food prices in St. Petersburg increased less than the average for Russia in May (17 percent).

An increase in prices in Moscow was noted for practically all commodity food groups but was, on average, at the all-Russian level of 22 percent for the month. At the same time food in the capital's markets went up in price 47 percent during the month. In Moscow markets one kilogram of beef costs, on average, 3,650 rubles [R] (this is 2.5 times above the average Russian level), cottage cheese costs R1,564 (2.2 times higher), and butter costs R3,649 (2.8 times higher).

In May, compared with April, the volume of sales of foodstuffs fell by an average of 3 percent (4 percent in stores). More foods were sold in unorganized trade in May than in April in five of the 11 economic regions. At the same time prices in unorganized trade increased 40 percent during the month (18 percent in organized trade).

The cost of a range of 19 of the most important foods at the end of May stood at R10,850, calculated for the month. The cost of this range in unorganized trade was 51 percent more than in organized trade. This "basket" went up in price 75 percent over the month in Vorkuta, 59 percent in Nizhniy Tagil, and 54 percent in Kazan, where the prices of the most important products had been kept down for a long period by the local authorities.

Supreme Soviet

Threat to Khasbulatov 'Should Not Be Exaggerated'

PM1006121593 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 9 Jun 93 p 1

[Report by Petr Akopov: "The Supreme Soviet Wants To... Lead Collectively"]

[Text] The Supreme Soviet Presidium session the evening before last took place behind closed doors and was evidently so serious that some of the participants even called it a "conference without official status." But, one way or another, the session took place, and for three and a half hours the leaders of parliament discussed the work style of the parliament's leadership and the work of the Constitutional Conference. The session examined an appeal by eight members of the Supreme Soviet Presidium accusing the speaker of leading parliament in an arbitrary fashion. Moreover, one of Khasbulatov's consistent opponents, Sergey Kovalev, condemned Khasbulatov's behavior at the Saturday session of the Constitutional Conference. In this way, the "anti-Khasbulatov opposition" used the scandal at the Constitutional Conference to launch an offensive against the power-hungry speaker. But despite the fact that centrist deputies have recently joined the ranks of presidium members unhappy with Khasbulatov, yesterday's session confirmed that the newfound anti-Khasbulatov lobby does not want to go too far in its fight with the speaker. The majority of the Presidium did not back Kovalev's move against Khasbulatov, saying they were unhappy that Ruslan Imranovich had not been given the opportunity to address the conference. But while backing the speaker in this particular episode, the Presidium members said they intended to transform their meeting from a silent one into a "real working body." That is, on the one hand, the Presidium backed Khasbulatov and, on the other hand, made it pretty clear that it intended to curtail Khasbulatov's autocratic behavior. As Oleg Rumyantsev said, the session participants realized that "unless there are checks and balances in the Supreme Soviet Chairman-Presidium-Parliament-Congress system, various relationships could be distorted." It is not something the Presidium members realized only yesterday, of course, but if at last they have publicly acknowledged the existence of "distortions," then it would be perfectly logical now to look at ways of straightening them out. But considering that the anti-Khasbulatov opposition comprises both "soft" and "hard," it is always possible that

the speaker will again succeed in exploiting his opponents' different interests and coming through unscathed. There certainly are differencese, and considerable ones at that. Whereas for the "hard" anti-Khasbulatov opposition the removal of the speaker is just the first step on the path to the demolition of the entire system of soviets, and above all the Supreme Soviet and the Congress, the Supreme Soviet chairman is unacceptable to the "soft" anti-Khasbulatov opposition only because he is too willful and unpredictable as a boss and difficult to control. They could well be satisfied if Khasbulatov were to demonstrate his devotion to "collective leadership." In relations with the executive authority the Presidium could have an important trump card in the accelerated adoption of the amendments to the Constitution outlined by the Ninth Congress and the adoption of the new Law on Elections, prepared by the Constitutional Commission, rather than haggling at the Constitutional Conference. This policy would make it possible to retain the present body of deputies and deprive the president's team of its trump card concerning the Congress' incompetence. It will require maximum effort by the entire leadership to get these laws adopted, but it is worth it. It is surprising that it did not occur to Khasbulatov to pursue this line, enabling him to grasp the initiative. Perhaps the speaker has certain hidden motives, particularly as he never makes ill-considered moves. So the possibility of Khasbulatov's being removed by his parliamentary colleagues should not be exaggerated. Ruslan Imranovich has been dismissed so many times that it is hard to believe his dismissal is actually possible.

Subcommittee Will Monitor Progress of Military Legislation

PM1106104793 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Jun 93 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Subcommittee Formed in Russian Federation Supreme Soviet To Monitor Implementation of Legislation on Defense Issues"]

[Text] The editorial office has received a press release signed by Aleksandr Piskunov, deputy chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet Committee on Defense and Security Questions, on the committee's 8 June session with the agenda "On the Concept of Parliamentary Control in the Defense Sphere."

The report by Deputy Aleksandr Voronin pointed out that the adopted Supreme Soviet laws and decrees on defense issues are not being fulfilled in full by ministries, departments, and local authorities. There is a delay over drawing up and submitting to the Supreme Soviet the legislative acts necessary for the Armed Forces and other troops, and measures are not being taken to fulfill the provisions of adopted laws and the decree of the Seventh Congress of People's Deputies "On the Situation in the Armed Forces and the Russian Federation's Military Policy."

The participants' speeches (representatives of the Armed Forces participated in the session, in particular Colonel General Valeriy Mironov, deputy minister of defense) expressed valid concern at the present state of affairs with regard to the maintenance of force levels by conscription, mobilization training, and the legal position of Russian servicemen in states which used to be republics of the USSR. As the discussion showed, these and other current problems arise because of the failure of the appropriate organs of the executive to fulfill existing legislation in the defense sphere.

For the purpose of ensuring constant and effective parliamentary control, the Committee on Defense and Security Questions passed a decree forming a corresponding subcommittee. Lieutenant Gen. Aleksandr Voronin was approved as chairman of the subcommittee.

Aleksandr Ivanovich Voronin is the deputy for the No. 251 Vyazemskiy Territorial District, Khabarovsk Kray. He was born in 1936. He is a graduate of Orel Tank School, the Military Political Academy, and the General Staff Military Academy.

Regional Affairs

Yekaterinburg Council Building Attacked by Grenade Launcher

LD1106061993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0612 GMT 11 Jun 93

[Text] Yekaterinburg June 11 TASS—The building housing the administration of the Sverdlovsk region in Yekaterinburg was fired at from a grenade laucher by unknown people late on Thursday [10 June], however there were no casualty reports as office hours were over already.

The grenade damaged the corner of the building at the seventh floor.

Police has not yet provided any comments to the incident.

This is the second grenade launcher attack on a public building in Yekaterinburg of late. Earlier the city police office was fired at after it arrested a leader of the local mafia.

Sakhalin Oblast Soviet Deputy on Situation in Kurils

OW1106073793

[Editorial Report] Vladivostok Radiostantsiya Tikhiy Okean Maritime Network in Russian 0715 GMT on 9 June carries its regular "Pacific Ocean" program, which features an interview with Fedor Kozhdanov, deputy of Sakhalin Oblast Soviet and chairman of a committee on the Kuril Islands, by Igor Vorobyev.

Kozhdanov says that residents of the southern Kurils feel abandoned by Russia and that the economic situation there is much worse than it is on Sakhalin, since salaries are much lower there while food prices are very high. He describes the assistance extended to fishing industry workers as inadequate and says that prices of fish products, inflated by distributors, hurt the industry, which has had to curtail production.

In answering Vorobyev's question on action by the Sakhalin Oblast Soviet to address the economic situation and transportation and fuel problems in the southern Kurils, Kozhdanov says there is no financial backing to take effective measures and that the program for turning the Kurils into free economic zone came to nothing because of the lack of real central support.

Kozhdanov also talks about the need to establish local control of natural resources in the region, since the Kurils receive no return for the massive fishing that is carried out in the area, and because the military vessels charged with protecting Russian borders from foreign poachers are unable to carry out their duty because of technical difficulties and shortages of fuel and personnel.

Commenting on results of the referendum in the Kurils, which showed strong support for Yeltsin, Kozhdanov says: "These results amazed me, but I think that the explanation lies in the fact that there is a stratum of people who find the present situation in the islands very advantageous—those who are connected to the export of sea products to Japan and the middlemen. Some consumer goods, such as cars, for example, arrive there, and for many there is a certain profit in it." Kozhdanov then says that people have not lost hope yet and still expect some action from the president, that every decree by the president is interpreted by local bureaucrats in ways that suit them first and foremost, and that they should be prosecuted for obstructing the implementation of presidential directives.

Economic Crisis Prompts Mass Exodus From Kuril Islands

LD1106100993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0834 GMT 11 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Belovitskiy]

[Text] Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk June 11 TASS—Many of the inhabitants of the southern Kurils will have to flee the islands this summer because of deteriorating living standards.

Three hundred families (out of the total of 2,500) living on the island of Shikotan are prevented from leaving for the Russian mainland only because of the lack of containers for their belongings.

The acute socio-economic crisis was aggravated by energy shortages running now for more than six months at a stretch, which prompted a mass exodus from the islands.

As of May 2, diesel fuel supplies to the population of the island of Kunashir were cut off. As a result, local power station, production and bread supplies came to a stop.

According to Mikhail Tko, chairman of the Southern Kuril District Soviet of People's Deputies, the average wage-earner in the community could hardly afford even a half of the bread basket.

The decree on socio-economic development of the Kurils which Russian President Boris Yeltsin signed six months ago still has not come into force, says Fedor Pyzhiyanov, chairman of the Kurils committee at the Sakhalinsk Regional Soviet of People's Deputies.

The decree provided for subsidies, social benefits and other privileges. However, the whole lot was hopelessly blocked inside the Moscow corridors of power, he said.

Stavropol Governor Asked To Oust 'Old Nomenklatura'

PM1006134393 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Jun 93 First Edition p 2

[Report by journalist Nikolay Gritchin: "Democratic Forces Demand Cadre Changes"]

[Text] In accordance with the decision of a combined plenum of democratic forces of Stavropol, Kray Governor Ye. Kuznetsov has been handed a letter asking for 10 important officials to be removed from their posts.

They are members of the old nomenklatura on whom democrats pin the responsibility for gross miscalculations in privatization and land reform and for the extremely high rate of production decline in the kray.

Attempt To Sell Army Weapons in Stavropol Cut Short

PM1106074793 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1000 GMT 7 Jun 93

[Report from Stavropol by V. Kuts and V. Telyatnikov; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] [Kuts] Since the arrival of airborne assault troops in Stavropol, the kray prosecutor's office and counterintelligence service have had considerably more work to do. For the second time in the last few weeks the provincial local press has published highly compromising details from the life of the 21st Airborne Assault Brigade.

What military unit is without weapons? Perhaps only the construction battalion. The 21st Airborne Assault Brigade men, redeployed here from beyond the Caucasus, are equipped with the full complement of the most modern weapons. These weapons must not only be able to hit targets accurately, they must also be closely guarded. God forbid that criminals get their hands on them. However, for the second time Stavropol is rife

with rumors about extraordinary goings-on in the airborne assault unit—attempts to sell weapons which are unaccounted for and were brought here from CIS hotspots.

The military counterintelligence service is to be congratulated. The would-be buyers and sellers were caught red-handed.

But who can estimate the moral damage to the reputation of the truly courageous and honest servicemen who have had high military decorations bestowed on them by the Russian Government in appreciation of their military labor?

Siberian Regions Agree To Seek Equal Status

PM1106084593 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 8 Jun 93 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report under the "Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow" rubric: "'Siberian Accord': Equal Status"]

[Text] The "Siberian Accord" Association has formulated a common position on the issue of granting krays and oblasts equal political and economic rights with the Russian Federation's constituent republics.

Vitaliy Mukha, chairman of the association's council, announced yesterday at a news conference in Novosibirsk that the leaders of the "Siberian Accord" member republics have supported the proposal by representatives of other Siberian territories to jointly advocate the idea of raising the status of krays and oblasts to the republic level at the Constitutional Conference.

Vorkuta Miners To Start General Strike 11 June

PM1106074993 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1600 GMT 7 Jun 93

[Report from Vorkuta by Ye. Kuznetsov; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] An extraordinary session of the council of mine labor collectives' representatives was held in Vorkuta 7 June. It was decided to hold an extraordinary citywide conference of mineworkers 10-11 June. The main issue to be discussed at the conference is a general strike. The social tension is due to delays in the payment of wages and holiday pay. Thousands of workers have yet to receive their pay for March. This situation has arisen as a result of nonpayments by companies. Among Vorkuta's main debtors are the Cherepovets and Novolipetsk metal combines and the Moscow chemical plant.

According to predictions by leaders of the independent union of mineworkers, the conference will declare an indefinite general strike as of 0001 hours 11 June.

A referendum opened 7 June at the striking Zapolyarnaya mine. Mine workers are staging a secret-ballot vote of confidence in the mine management. They tend to blame management for their troubles.

International Affairs

Kravchuk Sends Delegation to Geneva Disarmament Talks

AU1006143093 Kiev URYADOVYY KURYER in Ukrainian 8 Jun 93 p 1

[Unattributed report]

[Text] By his directive issued on 4 June 1993, "On the Ukrainian Delegation to the 14th Session of the Special Control Commission," Ukrainian President L.M. Kravchuk accepted the proposal by Ukraine's National Committee for Questions of Disarmament on sending a delegation to Geneva (Switzerland) to participate in the work of the 14th session of the Special Control Commission that was created to promote the implementation of the treaty between the USSR and the United States on eliminating medium and shorter-range missiles. The session will be held 7-25 June.

Expert Examines Question of Republic's Nuclear Status

MK1006102093 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 10 Jun 93 p 2

[Article by Lieutenant Colonel Vladimir Mukhin of the journal ARMIYA, under "Carte Blanche" rubric: "Can Ukraine Become a Nonnuclear State? Very Soon All Conditions May Be Ripe for the Republic To Become a De Facto Nuclear Superpower"]

[Text] The current problems regarding the Ukrainian parliament's attitude to the START I Treaty are reduced by many to the understanding that its adoption of the terms of this treaty automatically makes Ukraine a nonnuclear state. Indeed, in Lisbon on 23 May 1992, Ukraine, among the other four "nuclear" republics of the former USSR, signed an agreement and a protocol whereby it becomes a full-fledged participant to the treaty and also accedes to the terms of the START I Treaty: In a special message to the U.S. President it assumed an obligation within the first seven years after the enactment of the START I Treaty to abolish all nuclear weapons and all strategic offensive armaments. Meanwhile the current problems around the fate of the nuclear legacy of the USSR located in the republic are seen as the beginning of a difficult and long road that may not necessarily lead to Ukraine's delivering on its promises made in Lisbon and to an outcome welcome to the world community.

The problem here is not only that in violation of the assumed obligations a few days ago L. Kuchma, addressing the Ukrainian parliament, proposed that a temporary nuclear status be established for Ukraine or that this is demanded by 162 Ukrainian deputies. It is not ruled out that the ongoing "nuclear bickering" in the Ukrainian parliament are protracted battles, as they say, merely of a tactical character. There is plenty of evidence to suggest that the plan to turn Ukraine into a nuclear state is being covertly carried out already.

From the point of view of the republic's interests, this state of affairs does not lead to any great contradictions or questions. For instance, why should Ukraine not revise its geopolitical importance and take a new look at its role in Europe and the world? In terms of its population size, comparable to France, and in terms of the nuclear warheads located on its territory, exceeding France and Great Britain taken together, it asks itself, with the voice of its patriotically minded newspapers: Would it not become a "colossus with feet of clay" after the abolition of its nuclear and strategic weapons?" Ukraine, apart from its aspiration to obtain nuclear security guarantees, wants to be able to ensure these guarantees by itself.

This must be why, when preparing for the Lisbon meeting in early 1992, it took action to "privatize" strategic missile and long-range aviation units which were at the time part of the single CIS strategic forces. As of now the units and formations of the 43d Strategic Forces army have been transferred under Ukraine's jurisdiction; the majority of army officers have sworn the Ukrainian military oath and become citizens of the republic. The same happened with the units of the former USSR long-range aviation division stationed in Ukraine.

The question arises: Why should Ukraine, which has expressed the intention to abolish nuclear and strategic weapons within seven years, place under its protection the officers of strategic missile units whose fate has already been predetermined? This apparently means that both the officers and the state are hoping for something. Just what they are hoping for becomes more or less clear when one analyzes the new structure of military training in the republic. For example, the Higher Military Engineering Missile Forces Academy, which was recently created as part of the Air Defense Military Engineering Academy, and the Military Aviation Radio-Electronics Schools under the Kharkov Military University, will be training, in addition to other specialists, officers specializing in missile and space systems and complexes. As we can see, a long-term professional basis is being laid down for missile forces. Ukraine would hardly be spending its precious karbovantsy on training missile operation specialists if it wanted to rid itself fully of strategic weapons.

So far, however, Ukraine's control over the nuclear weapons located in the republic is limited. As L. Kravchuk recently said in an interview with TIME magazine, he can block a missile launch from Ukraine's territory not by technical or mechanical means but by an order, a command. At present the strategic nuclear forces of the former USSR are de jure and de facto controlled by Russian President B. Yeltsin and Marshal Ye. Shaposhnikov, commander-in- chief of the CIS Joint Armed Forces. The missiles located on Ukraine's territory (just like in Kazakhstan and Belarus) have been taken off alert

duty and transferred to the reserves. But this situation may not be continue for long.

The Ukrainian special services are making no secret of the fact that one of the main directions in their activity involves "attracting" former USSR officers to the Ukrainian Armed Forces.

The main efforts by the military intelligence service are primarily concentrated on maintaining advanced, highly effective new-generation weapons and military equipment, whose production in Ukraine is complicated by the absence of military manufacturing facilities there. This primarily refers to missile and aviation equipment, communication means and maintenance and operations bases. The fruits of this work are, as they say, plain to see.

In spite of the fact that in February 1992 during the "privatization" and special treatment by special services, three- quarters of commanders and pilots of the long-range heavy bomber aviation regiment near Uzin refused to take orders from the Ukrainian leadership and asked the CIS Joint Armed Forces commander- in-chief to do everything in his power to prevent the division from falling under Ukraine's jurisdiction, today Colonel G. Kotlyar, commander of the heavy bomber division, in an interview with the Ukrainian Defense Ministry's newspaper NARODNA ARMIY stated that the formation is ready to carry out a combat mission and protect the people of Ukraine. Within a year the sovereign Ukrainian strategic bombers division, whose personnel had been halved, has managed to restore its combat readiness and to replenish its ranks almost entirely with the "defectors" from the CIS countries and Russia.

As though in response to the opponents from the Russian military leadership who state that Ukraine is not capable of operating heavy bombers since it lacks many technical servicing means and documentation, Ukraine is publishing stories and reports in the press about how strategic bombers are flying in Ukraine's skies and how they are being serviced and maintained.

The question suggests itself here: If Ukraine has fully mastered the operation of heavy bombers and the long-range aviation division is capable of accomplishing combat missions, then with what means—using conventional weapons, or nuclear bombs and missiles whose total stocks in the republic approximate 200 units? If Ukraine has broken the codes set on nuclear aviation ammunition, this means that the republic has de facto become a nuclear power.

The United States is offering Ukraine financial assistance after the ratification of the START I Treaty to dismantle the missiles, which is nearly 10 times less than the required sum cited by Ukrainian experts. According to Ukrainian specialists, to eliminate nuclear warheads some $2 billion is needed, and $3 billion to destroy the silos. Maybe, indeed, the Ukrainian leadership has good reason not to waste itself away on making promises on the START I Treaty and not to "yield to the miserly handouts from across the ocean?" This question in some form or another is today confronting many of those who have something to do with the fate of nuclear weapons.

Meanwhile, in order to create an autonomous nuclear weapons controls system and also a system to produce and test these weapons, and so forth, at least $40 billion would be required. For the sake of comparison, in 1992 the Ukrainian treasury received a mere $167 million in export revenues. The income of the agricultural sector in 1993 are expected to reach $30 billion.

Legal Expert Favors Keeping Nuclear Status

AU1006121293 Kiev HOLOS UKRAYINY in Ukrainian 8 Jun 93 p 6

[Interview with international law specialist Volodymyr Hryhorovych Butkevych by Valentyn Labunskyy; place and date not given: "On an Impulse of Political Romanticism, We Wagged Our Tongue About Ukraine's Nuclear-Free Status and Now We Are Paying for This"]

[Text] The discussion of "should or should not Ukraine be a nuclear power" has reached a climax. Opponents of our state's nuclear status believe that hastily eliminating nuclear weapons will harm Ukrainian security irreparably. Its proponents are, conversely, convinced that missiles with nuclear warheads constitute a burden for the Ukrainian people and delayed-action bombs on our land. HOLOS UKRAYINY has opened its pages to political scientists, deputies, and military figures to discuss these problems. Today, Volodymyr Butkevych, a well-known specialist in international law, reflects on this theme in an interview with our correspondent.

[Labunskyy] Volodymyr Hryhorovych, wasn't it a mistake, first, to declare Ukraine nuclear-free, nonaligned, and neutral and then seriously reconsider it all?

[Butkevych] Of course, it was a mistake. Disregarding international law and simply common sense. It is not too late to correct this mistake, because there is a precedent in international law for states to make a certain statement unilaterally, but remain juridically free and have the right to revise its own declarations.

We declared our nuclear-free and permanently neutral status on an impulse of political romanticism. It has now become clear, however, that Ukraine cannot be an absolutely neutral state. After World War II, Americans repeatedly stated that it is immoral to be permanently neutral at a time when the whole world is fighting to strengthen the collective security system.

Regarding our state's nuclear-free status, we had to weigh our every word, but we have, unfortunately, disregarded this. If we do, after all, change our status from nuclear to nuclear-free, then the preparation of legal materials alone, materials that will make it possible to put everything on new principles, will cost much more than the 175 million [monetary unit not specified] promised by the United States. No one made conducted

expert legal or economic expert analysis of such a transition. We just wagged our tongues and that's all, and now we are paying for this.

[Labunskyy] How should we emerge from this situation?

[Butkevych] Ukraine must only declare its decision to strive for nuclear-free status, but concurrently with the nuclear disarmament of the United States, Great Britain, France, China, and Russia. It is quite possible that Ukraine will be the first to show how this is done, but only provided that an agreement is concluded in accordance with which all nuclear powers will assume certain obligations with regard to Ukraine by offering it guarantees of future security. Security is not just meeting high-ranking officials at an airport, something that may be regulated by standards of international politeness. Security is the main thing in the policy of any state. It may only be regulated by international agreements that occupy the preeminent position in the hierarchy of international law. That is why, today, when U.S. and Russian politicians declare that they will guarantee Ukraine's security after it ratifies START-1, this is not serious talk.

Ukraine must not agree to this option, because it will not receive any guarantees at all if it does. Advocates of the position according to which Ukraine must, already today, ratify START-1, reason that we do not have either the scientific or technological capability to service intercontinental ballistic missiles and maintain them in proper order. One feels like asking: Did Ukraine have no such specialists before or, maybe, they escaped to Moscow? I did not hear anything to this effect. Ukraine's financial possibilities constitute yet another argument in favor of ratifying the treaty as fast as possible. According to statistics, however, expenditure on the destruction of nuclear missile weapons is much greater that on their maintenance or even manufacture. There is no doubt: Our young state does not need nuclear missile weapons. However, I am against giving Ukraine the role of a state that is guilty in regard to someone else. It is humiliating for us. We do not owe anything to anybody.

Ukraine's nuclear potential may be reoriented to peaceful goals. Ukraine is presently in a quite difficult situation regarding oil and gas. Scientists emphasize that the situation may change if we make use of deep drilling, because we have these minerals at great depths. However, they can only be extracted through the kind of drilling that involves nuclear explosions. We will not be able to do this if we become a nuclear-free state, because the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty will prevent us from doing this. If we ratify this treaty, we will assume the role of outcasts. It might seem that the treaty stipulates sharing scientific achievements with us in the field of nuclear power engineering, but patent legislation in the West is particularly strict in this sphere. Western states do not even share their simplest scientific accomplishments with us. This will lead to a situation when we will wait "in line" to procure fuel for our nuclear electric power plants. I do not think that we will get such fuel there [in the West].

Having become nuclear-free, Ukraine will also violate article after article of international agreements within the framework of the regulations specified by the International Atomic Energy Authority. Due to the absence of corresponding national legislation, these will be the consequences of ratifying START-1 and the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

[Labunskyy] You said that multilateral agreements with nuclear powers could become guarantees for Ukrainian security. History teaches, however, that the USSR repeatedly ignored laws, regarding international treaties as worthless pieces of paper. Is there not the risk that Russia will treat new agreements in precisely this way? Can international agreements provide 100 percent guarantees for our security? Wouldn't it be more reliable to strive for an integration into the system of collective security, for example, NATO?

[Butkevych] In principle, this is more reliable and more promising, but in our Declaration of State Sovereignty we also blocked this direction. It is now necessary to make a statement to the effect that, in view of the circumstance that not a single state responded to this Declaration in a legal manner and proceeding from the situation that has developed in the world, Ukraine cancels the corresponding statements of the Declaration. This would be more sensible and straightforward than declaring one thing and do another.

Regarding the reliability of the guarantees provided by international agreements, it is clear that not a single one of them provides a 100-percent guarantee. This is more reliable, however, than promises at receptions given by Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin.

[Labunskyy] Why does the United States need to put pressure on Ukraine? Is Ukraine destabilizing the situation in Europe by remaining a nuclear power?

[Butkevych] Americans are afraid of new nuclear powers. Once they recognized that the United States, the USSR, Great Britain, France, and China are such world powers, they do not want any others to emerge. Besides, American politicians proceed from the position of the United States' own interests. It is more safe for them to deal with four nuclear powers than to allow new countries to join the "nuclear club." However, I am convinced that, over time, the United States will also understand our interests, because, in this cruel and unpredictable world, to do such a thing as nuclear disarmament in haste would, at least, mean not to think about the future.

Navy Criticizes Transfer of Black Sea Civilian Staff

LD1106103793 Kiev Ukrayinske Radio First Program Network in Russian 0900 GMT 11 Jun 93

[Text] Vice Admiral Baltin, commander of the Black Sea Fleet, has signed a directive transfering the fleet's civilian staff to Russia's Defense Ministry payroll. The Ukraine Navy Command has interpreted this step as interference in our country's internal affairs.

Defense Ministry Assails TV Report on Nuclear Maintenance

LD1106105893 Kiev UKRINFORM in Russian 0916 GMT 11 Jun 93

[By UKRINFORM correspondent]

[Text] Kiev, 11 Jun—In a news program by the Ostankino television company on the visit to Ukraine of U.S. Defense Secretary Les Aspin it was reported that not only does Ukraine not have enough money for disarmament, it does not even have enough to service nuclear missile complexes. In particular it was stated: "Money for carrying out maintenance work has not been allocated for six months already, while the Ministry of Defense of Ukraine does not allow Russian specialists access to these sites."

In connection with this the press service of the Ministry of Defense of Ukraine is authorized to state: The information in question does not correspond to reality. Ukraine has been and has not stopped financing the servicing and upkeep of nuclear facilities on its territory. For Russian specialists to carry out inspection guaranteed by the originators of these facilities, the press service statement says, the Ministry of Defense of Ukraine has allocated 700 million Russian rubles, including 152 million rubles in June 1993 to the directorate of Russia's strategic missile troops.

Over the entire period of the existence of Ukraine's Armed Forces there has not been a single case of denial of access to nuclear missile facilities for experts or specialists from the Russian Federation. Today, the statement stresses, at the request of Marshal of Aviation Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, the commander in chief of the CIS Joint Armed Forces, there is a group of specialists from the Ministry of Defense of Russia at these facilities.

The press service of the Ukrainian defense department draws attention to the fact that this is not the first time that the Ostankino television company has spread distorted information about Ukraine. It cannot be rated as anything other than a manifestation of unfriendliness. Such "mistakes," the press service concludes, ill befit a television company which has a multi-million audience both in Russia and beyond its borders.

Germany's Kohl Ends Visit; Agreements Concluded

LD1006162793 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 1500 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Text] A final meeting was held between President of Ukraine Leonid Kravchuk, Prime Minister Leonid Kuchma, and Federal Chancellor of the FRG Helmut Kohl today early in the afternoon. Members of the delegations of Germany and Ukraine took part in it. The meeting was held behind closed doors.

After it ended, a package of Ukrainian-German documents was signed. Among them are the agreement on the development of wide- scope cooperation in the field of economy, industry, science, and technology; the agreements on aviation, motor vehicle, and seafaring communications; on cooperation in the field of environmental protection; cooperation in issues of mutual interest in connection with nuclear and technological safety and radiation protection; on the settlement of issues of the elimination of nuclear weapons, and others.

A joint statement on scientific and technological cooperation was also signed.

Also today, Helmut Kohl departed from Kiev.

Meets Plyushch, Backs Reforms

LD1006173993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1716 GMT 10 Jun 93

[By UKRINFORM correspondents Viktor Demidenko and Aleksey Petrunya for TASS]

[Text] Kiev June 10 TASS—"Germany regards Ukraine as a friend and partner and will build its relations with this country on the basis of respect and mutual advantage", German Chancellor Helmut Kohl said on Thursday during his meeting with Ukrainian Parliament Chairman Ivan Plyushch. The meeting centred on development of bilateral relations, as well as on the current situation in Europe.

Addressing a news conference at the close of his official visit to Ukraine, the chancellor noted that unified Germany would like Ukraine to go ahead with reforms. He stressed that the documents, which were signed in the course of the visit, proved to this aspiration. Kohl also reported that he would come up at the Copenhagen meeting of the EC Commission with a proposal to open Western markets to Ukraine.

The German chancellor expressed satisfaction at the stance taken by the Ukrainian leaders in the matter of nuclear disarmament. The former Soviet republic's official authorities favour ratification of the START-1 Accord and joining the Lisbon Protocol. Kohl intends to bring this fact to the notice of the Group of Seven major industrialized countries, which is to meet in Tokyo shortly.

In the afternoon the German chancellor left Kiev for Sofia. He was seen off at the airport by Ukraine's Prime Minister Leonid Kuchma and other officials.

German Minister Apologizes for 'Illegal' Toxic Waste Dumping

LD1006125393 Hamburg DPA in German 1055 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Text] Kiev (DPA)—During Chancellor Helmut Kohl's visit to Kiev, Federal Environment Minister Klaus Toepfer apologized for the illegal toxic waste transported to Ukraine. "I have to apologize for the fact that this type of criminal development was possible and that a danger to the population arose in several locations in Ukraine," Toepfer told journalists today. He announced that experts will soon be dispatched to help to make safe 230 tonnes of highly toxic waste in the town of Rovno.

Before leaving for Bulgaria later today, Kohl made a positive assessment of his visit to Ukraine. "Despite the difficult economic situation, I do not have the slightest doubt that Ukraine will solve its problems," he said. Germany will do its bit by giving the people "help to help themselves." He spoke of giving relations with Moscow and with Kiev the same priority: "We need both". Kohl underlined that Bonn wants to "immediately breath life" into the basic joint declaration that was signed yesterday. He also agreed with the Ukrainian leadership to continue discussion on the problem of resettling Russian Germans before the summer recess.

The federal ministers accompanying Kohl—Guenter Rexrodt (economy), Toepfer (environment), Matthias Wissmann (transport) and Paul Krueger (research)—signed agreements with their Ukrainian partners today in the spheres of economic cooperation, environmental protection and transport.

National Affairs

Kravchuk Says Government Resignation 'Out of the Question'

LD1006190493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1840 GMT 10 Jun 93

[By UKRINFORM for TASS]

[Text] Kiev June 10 TASS—"The resignation of the government and the prime minister is out of the question and this question will never be raised," Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk said on Ukrainian television on Thursday [10 June] night.

Describing the economic situation in the country, Kravchuk said that it was extremely complex. According to Kravchuk, the president, the parliament and the government are working under an extremely tough schedule. Kravchuk said that a number of decrees and instructions would be signed in the near future to lessen the pressure of prices on the population.

In view of this, the president called to refrain from staging strikes, adding that the only way out of the economic crisis is the constructive work of each citizen and each work collective. On Thursday, a session of the Presidium of the Ukrainian Government was held, chaired by the Ukrainian Prime Minister Leonid Kuchma. The Presidium discussed problems raised by Ukrainian miners during their strike. Vice prime ministers and leaders of corresponding ministries and departments were instructed to urgently make proposals for the settlement of these problems and submit thm to a session of the cabinet of ministers scheduled for 14 June.

Problems, demanding solution by the Ukrainian parliament, would be submitted to it by the government for discussion at its next session.

Warns Against 'End of Democracy'

WS1106083993 Kiev UNIAN in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Text] President Kravchuk addressed Ukrainian citizens with a speech on Ukrainian TV at 1600 GMT on 10 June. He pointed out that the resignation of the government has been and still is out of the question. "A fight for power is continuing in Ukraine"—said the president—"and some political leaders have been changing their slogans and moving from simple opposition to constructive opposition, from supporting the administration to demanding its resignation. A balanced position is one thing, while playing political and economic games is quite different." The president stressed that the people are the only source of power, while political parties are engaged in using them. He supported the proposal to adopt a new elections law and hold parliamentary elections. He stated: "Individuals are not the key today. Today, no one is clinging to power. The most important thing is not to stop the process of democratization and restructuring." During the speech, the president emphasized several times that strikes are a road leading to nowhere.

The president pointed out: "I am sure that the forces that are calling for strikes today, tomorrow—having obtained power—will do everything to ban strikes forever. The revolution of 1917 also began with strikes and meetings. However, in the 1930's, those who participated in them were sent to the Gulag, while those who orchestrated them made it to the top of administration. A similar situation is inevitable. This was the end of democracy, because the state chose the path of lawlessness."

Further, the president noted the successful work of the groups tasked with drafting decrees, orders, and resolutions to be signed shortly. According to the president, the most relevant decision with regard to the people's social welfare will be made on Saturday or Monday. Leonid Kravchuk assessed the main avenues for the achievement of stability, including transforming enterprises into joint stock companies, indexing the capital stock, adopting the coefficient of wage increases, and

improving the taxation system. He promised full government support for all reasonable proposals regarding self-rule, including the suggestions put forward by four Donetsk-Dniepr area oblasts.

"Only peace, accord, and labor can grant us a normal political, economic, and spiritual life"—said the president. He expressed hope that the Ukrainian nation has enough common sense to understand this.

Government Orders Examination of Miners' Demands

LD1106111793 Kiev Ukrayinske Radio First Program Network in Russian 0900 GMT 11 Jun 93

[Text] Yesterday's sitting of the presidium of Ukraine's Cabinet of Ministers under the chairmanship of Prime Minister Leonid Kuchma considered the demands of the striking miners in the Donbass. It gave instructions to the relevant bodies to work out urgent proposals to enable the government and parliament to resolve these questions.

Kharkov Oblast Supports Striking Donbass Miners Demands

LD1006151693 Kiev UKRINFORM in Russian 1156 GMT 10 Jun 93

[By UKRINFORM correspondent Leonid Zamyatin]

[Text] Kharkov, 10 Jun—The demands of striking miners in Donbass were supported at a session of the Kharkov oblast Strike Committee yesterday. A decision was adopted on holding a one-day, for the moment, warning strike on 24 June, in which many tens of thousands of workers of the Kharkov industrial center and other towns of the oblast will take part.

It was noted at the session of the Strike Committee that the strike by labor collectives of Kharkov oblast is an extreme measure and called forth by the continuing deepening of the economic and political crisis in the country, the unwise policies of all branches of power, unemployment, and the impoverishment and lack of rights of people.

All of the speakers were indignant at the latest increase in prices, that has left the majority of the country's citizens below the poverty level. The speakers were unanimous in that the upper echelons of power do not know how to get out of the economic crisis and have not thought of anything better than laying the burden of adversities on working people, pensioners, and all of the deprived and the humiliated.

The labor collectives will go on strike not only with the demands advanced by the Donbass miners, but also with a number of their own. In the first place a demand to provide work for all workers of enterprises and organizations under state management; then to cancel the government Resolution Number 71 of 31 January of this year, on limiting the fund for payment for labor for state enterprises; to enter a single ruble and economic zone together with the CIS countries; to elaborate and publish an economic program for getting the country out of crisis, that everyone would understand; and others.

The speakers at the meeting of the Strike Committee noted that the president, the government, and the Supreme Council still have time to respond to the demands of the labor collectives of Donetsk, Kharkov, and other oblasts of Ukraine, and to adopt the necessary measures with which to remove the tension.

Strike Official Calls Vice Premier's Speech 'Provocation'

WS1106092993 Kiev UNIAN in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Text] On the third day of the 1989 miners' strike, some 100 mines were on strike; on the third day of the current strike, the number is 150. At 0500 GMT [on 10 June] the square in front of the oblast soviet was filled with columns of workers. Donetsk strikers sent delegations to Kharkov, Zaporozhye, and Dnepropetrovsk to coordinating their actions. Serhiy Illyashenko, representative of the Independent Trade Union of Miners, told a UNIAN correspondent that on the morning of 10 June, a conflict broke out in the seventh section of the Gorkiy mine. The mine manager tried to force the first shift to go into the pits, disregarding the strike schedule. He misinformed the miners by saying that all the issues had been solved, and threatened to fire them. This incident prompted the Donetsk Strikers Committee to issue a statement saying that repeated attempts to put administrative pressure on workers may result in more stringent measures on their part.

Speaking to a UNIAN correspondent, Mykhaylo Krylov, Donetsk Strikers Committee cochairman, called Vice Prime Minister Pynzenyk's speech on Ukrainian TV "a provocation." He said the miners were enraged by Pynzenyk's assertion that the Ukrainian people live better than other CIS republics. According to the strikers, referring to the miners' strike as a microconflict is disinformation and an attempt to create a split among the ranks of the united strikers.

Lugansk Miners Call For Donbass Independence

WS1106095793 Kiev UNIAR in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Text] The Presidium of the Lugansk Oblast Trade Union Federation has supported the coal miners' demands and decided to call a two-hour warning strike from 0900 to 1100 on 15 June. The Lugansk Coal Miners' Strike Committee has relayed its demands to the Ukrainian president, chairman of the Supreme Soviet, and prime minister. The coal miners are calling for the immediate (within 24 hours) announcement of a comprehensive program for leading Ukraine out of the artificially created economic deadlock; wage adjustments for blue- and white-collar workers according to the

current rate of inflation; the liquidation of all commercial entities and the introduction of tax declarations; and the cancellation of all wage ceilings. Lugansk coal miners are also pressing for the regional independence of Donbass, which should be incorporated into the new Ukrainian Constitution. According to the Ukrainian Interior Ministry, 37 (more than 2.5 thousand workers) of the 105 enterprises related to the coal mining industry have joined the strike. Eduard Khananov, president's representative in the Lugansk Oblast, proposed convening an emergency session of the Supreme Soviet and extending necessary powers to the president. The Socialist Party, the VKP(b) [All-Russian Communist Party of Bolsheviks], "Yedinstvo" [Unity], and the "Trudovaya Luganshchina" [Working Lugansk] Association led a meeting, held under red flags and communist slogans, which took place in the square near the oblast administration. Despite the general strike, the Stakhanvyhillya coal association, once managed by the present Vice Prime Minister Yuriy Ioffe, continues to operate on a regular basis. Although the losses incurred by the strike have amounted to 600-700 million karbovanets, the oblast administration has not increased food prices.

Semenov Back From Moscow With Proposals for Kravchuk

LD1006125793 Kiev UKRINFORM in Russian 0954 GMT 10 Jun 93

[By UKRINFORM correspondent Mikhail Stetsyuk]

[Text] Sevastopol, 10 Jun—Viktor Semenov, chairman of the Sevastopol town council of people's deputies, has returned from Moscow, after meetings and conversations with Russian President Boris Yeltsin and Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev, with a package of proposals on resolving the political and socioeconomic problems in the fleet and in the town. Semenov intends to hand these proposals over to Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk in the near future. It is possible that the active position of the representative of local authority could speed up the negotiating process on the problems of Sevastopol and the Black Sea fleet.

Belarus

U.S. Special Envoy Talbott Arrives in Minsk

LD1006164293 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1442 GMT 10 Jun 93

[By BELINFORM correspondent Larisa Klyuchnikova for TASS]

[Text] Minsk June 10 TASS—U.S. special envoy Strobe Talbott, an adviser of the U.S. secretary of state for new independent states, has arrived in Minsk on a one-day visit. He is accompanied by a group of senior officials from different departments, including the finance and defence departments.

During the meeting with Belarusian Parliament Chairman Stanislav Shushkevich on Thursday, Talbott handed in a personal message from the U.S. President Bill Clinton. At the request of the American side, the meeting was held behind closed doors. It was reported that issues of bilateral relations were discussed. Much of the meeting was devoted to discussions of the forthcoming visit by the Belarusian Parliament chairman to the United States, which is scheduled for July 23.

According to Shushkevich, the American side has set no conditions for the development of bilateral relations depending on the pace of economic reforms in Belarus. "The dialogue was carried on with dignity," Shushkevich said.

Later in the day, the U.S. delegation met with Belarusian Prime Minister Vyacheslav Kebich and Foreign Minister Petr Kravchenko.

Holds 'Polite' Talks With Shushkevich

WS1006130993 Minsk BELINFORM in Russian 1134 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Text] Strobe Talbott, the U.S. secretary of state's special adviser on CIS affairs, has paid a one-day visit to Minsk. A group of officials representing different departments, including the Departments of Defense and Treasury, accompanied him.

The special envoy met Supreme Soviet Chairman Stanislav Shushkevich and handed him a personal message from President Bill Clinton. During the talks, which were held behind closed doors at the U.S. side's request, issues of bilateral relations were discussed. Speaking about the situation in Belarus, Stanislav Shushkevich said that "the reforms are advancing more slowly than in other republics of the former USSR." He also pointed out that Belarus is in a more dramatic situation because of the consequences of the Chernobyl accident.

Special attention was paid to the discussion of Chairman Shushkevich's visit to the United States, scheduled for 23 July. According to Stanislav Shushkevich, the U.S. side did not condition the development of bilateral relations on the progress of economic reforms in Belarus. "The talks were polite," Stanislav Shushkevich stated.

The U.S. delegation was also received by Council of Ministers Chairman Vyacheslav Kebich and Foreign Minister Petr Kravchanka.

Strobe Talbott talked to representatives of different parties and movements of Belarus. A participant at the meeting, Social Democratic Assembly Chairman Oleg Trusov said: "Only just now, the Americans have begun to realize that the Republic of Belarus exists."

Government Pledges To Withhold First Use of Nuclear Weapons

LD1006163593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1553 GMT 10 Jun 93

[By BELINFORM for TASS]

[Text] Minsk June 10 TASS—The Belarusian Parliament ratified on Thursday the "agreement on joint measures regarding nuclear weapons" which was signed by four nuclear former Soviet republics in Almaty on December 21.

According to the document, Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine confirmed their commitment to refrain from the first use of nuclear weapons. Until the complete elimination of former Soviet nuclear arsenal on the Belarusian and Ukrainian territories the decision on the use of the weapons is to be agreed with parties to the agreement.

The BELINFORM News Agency said that by ratification of the agreement by Belarus confirmed its adherence to non-proliferation and the desire to eliminate all nuclear weapons.

Republic Hit by 'Severe' Economic Crisis

LD1006144693 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 0800 GMT 10 Jun 93

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] According to data from the National Bank, inflation in Belarus today is 10 percent higher than in Russia. It has also overtaken Russia in the growth of the money mass. And the need for a sharp increase in means of payment and credit resources is not only failing to decrease, but is growing. The exacerbation of the situation is promoting a deterioration in matters relating to the republic's accounts with other countries, first and foremost in payments to Russia, the mutual debts with which, albeit equal ones, are actually encroaching on economic ties with the Commonwealth. In these circumstances, the authorities do not hide the fact that the republic has found itself in an extremely severe monetary and credit crisis. And, although just as before on an official level, statements are being heard about Belarus'

efforts for a common ruble zone, from a technical point of view, the republic is already ready to introduce its own national currency.

Consulate General Opens in London

LD1106102893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0714 GMT 11 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Yuriy Sidorov]

[Text] London June 11 TASS—The first diplomatic mission of Belarus, a consulate-general, has been opened in the British capital. Its main task is to strengthen business, cultural and sports relations between the two countries. At the same time, a diplomatic mission of the British Foreign Office opened in Minsk.

Moldova

U.S. Envoy Talbott Arrives in Moldova

LD0906184193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1820 GMT 9 Jun 93

[by ITAR-TASS correspondent Valeriy Demidetskiy]

[Text] Chisinau, June 9 TASS—Strobe Talbott, U.S. President's special envoy to the commonwealth arrived in Moldova on Wednesday. Upon arrival the envoy told reporters that he is going to discuss with President Mircea Snegur and other Moldovan leaders problems concerning the relations between the USA and the former Soviet republic and those of security in the region.

Talbott had a meeting with President Snegur and Speaker Petru Luchinskiy.

Meets Snegur, Discusses Reform

AU1106104893 Chisinau BASAPRESS in English 1925 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Text] Chisinau, BASAPRESS 10/6/1993—The United States support the efforts of the leadership of Moldova concerning the complete withdrawal of the foreign military forces out of the territory of Moldova, according to the decisions of CSCE declared Strobe Talbott, the ambassador with special mandates, adviser for the new independent states of the State Secretariat of the USA, during the meeting with President Mircea Snegur and the President of Parliament Petru Lucinschi. According to a communique from the Press Service of the Presidency, Strobe Talbott demonstrated a genuine interest towards the way economic and political reforms are developing in Moldova, reaffirming the support of the U.S. Government for independence and territorial integrity of the republic. President Snegur mentioned that the direct support by the USA, as well as the support of international organizations, in solving political and economic problems was very important for Moldova. He solicited the approval of the USA for the six political detainees from Tiraspol to be handed over to the authorities in Chisinau.

Tiraspol Government Pleads for 'Idea of Confederation'

AU1106104293 Chisinau BASAPRESS in English 1925 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Text] Tiraspol, BASAPRESS 10/6/1993—Many variances exist between Chisinau and Tiraspol but their positions could be improved if there is a will, stated the president of the Supreme Soviet of the self-proclaimed Dniestrian Republic, Grigori Maracuta, in an interview for OLVIA-PRESS agency. Maracuta declared that Dniester has good relations with representatives of executive and legislative powers from the Russian Federation. It will permit the acquisition of fuel and cereals from Russia and he also stressed that "Russia helps us by providing hardcash. Referring to the conflict between Caraman and Litkal from one side and some representatives of Staff of Work Collective (SWC), from the other side concerning the problem of accordance with Moldova, Maracuta indicates that the divergencies are connected only with the problem of tactics but not the strategy while the Government from Tiraspol pleads for the idea of confederation. The heads of the legislative power from Dniester pointed out that actually there are not any serious disagreements between the Government of the self-proclaimed Dniester Republic and the Supreme Soviet. In spite of the fact that "some forces attempt to impinge the Supreme Soviet by confrontation with presidential and governmental structures, we didn't achieve this" declared Maracuta.

Lalumiere Pleads for 'Fair Trial' of Detainees

AU1106104493 Chisinau BASAPRESS in English 1925 GMT 10 Ju 93

[Text] Chisinau, BASAPRESS 10/6/1993—Catherine Lalumiere, the general secretary of the European Council, made a declaration concerning the detainees from Tiraspol, communicates the Mass-Media Directorate of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "I want to express my genuine deep concern about the fate of the six citizens of Moldova detained as prisoners and judged in the East of the Republic in Tiraspol," stated Lalumiere in the declaration. "I address to all responsible individuals to guarantee for these prisoners strict respect of their civil rights and the elementary principles characteristic of a state based on human rights. The detainees should be judged only by a tribunal formed according to the recent laws and to the Constitution of Moldova. I especially insist on the necessity of guaranteeing a fair trial in front of an impartial and independent tribunal and on treatment of the detainees according to the civil rights standards which are shared by all the members of CSCE," indicates the declaration.

Kyrgyzstan

Akayev: Reforms 'Impossible' Without Russian Cooperation

LD1006082993 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0635 GMT 10 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Boris Maynayev]

[Text] Bishkek, 10 Jun—"Today we mark the first anniversary of the Treaty on Friendship and Cooperation between the Russian Federation and the Republic of Kyrgyzstan, that is of great significance to us", said President Askar Akayev, during his meeting with Russian Ambassador Mikhail Romanov.

According to Akayev, it will be impossible to achieve reforms in Kyrgyzstan without close cooperation with Russia. Old economic ties that had been severed are now being restored on a qualitatively new basis, that is in the interest of both states.

Only culture can strengthen the fraternity of the CIS states, underlined the president. Therefore the republic gives great importance to the opening of the Slavonic University and the conservation of a single information space within the CIS.

Agreement Signed With Poland; Walesa Invited To Visit

LD1106102493 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 0700 GMT 11 Jun 93

[Text] A friendship and cooperation treaty has been signed between the Kyrgyz Republic and Poland. An ITAR-TASS correspondent was told at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs today that a consular convention and an agreement on intergovernmental ties, cultural and scientific cooperation, and the protection of the burial sites of and monuments to the victims of the war and repressions were also signed, along with the treaty. Polish President Lech Walesa was given a personal message from the president of the Kyrgyz Republic, inviting him to pay a visit to Kyrgyzstan.

Military Questions Need for Own Armed Forces

PM0806122193 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Jun 93 p 2

[Anatoliy Ladin Report: "Kyrgyzstan: Army Problems Acute"]

[Text] Bishkek—The Army's problems are, as you know, directly dependent on the state of the republic's economy.

In its turn, the Army can only expect to receive funds that the budget has at its disposal. In order to appreciate the "wealth" of the budget today, let me cite just a few figures.

In the first quarter of the year Kyrgyzstan's GNP dropped 27.5 percent. National income stood at 75.8 percent of the figure for the corresponding period of 1992. Many production units are being axed and industrial and trading enterprises are "gobbling up" the last remaining stocks of material resources. It is therefore becoming harder and harder to supply the troop units and establishments that switched to the republic's jurisdiction following the breakup of the USSR Armed Forces with all they need.

The worsening problems have forced the republic's military leadership to tell the president, the Supreme Soviet chairman, the prime minister, and the vice president of the difficulties that are retarding the development of the national army. The letter says in particular that an answer must be found in the immediate future to the main question that is primarily worrying officers—does Kyrgyzstan need its own armed forces? The point is that, during an official visit to Japan, Askar Akayev said that Kyrgyzstan is the only CIS member state that will not in the future have an army of its own. At the same time the Constitution, which parliament adopted fairly recently, says that "Kyrgyzstan's Armed Forces will be developed in accordance with the principle of self-defense and defense sufficiency." And Article 47 says that "the president of the Kyrgyz Republic is the commander in chief of the Armed Forces, and appoints and replaces the supreme command of the Kyrgyz Republic's Armed Forces." All this gives us grounds to think that Askar Akayev is today ready to sacrifice the Armed Forces in order to find a way to break the economic deadlock for his sovereign state and cut spending primarily at the Army's expense. It is logical that many units and establishments under the jurisdiction of the State Committee for Defense Affairs are currently short of 30-50 percent of their full complement of officers.

I learned from conversations with officers in various positions in the republic's State Committee for Defense Affairs that most of them see the solution to the Army's problems in the further development of integration ties in the defense sphere with Russia and the other CIS states that are party to the Collective Security Treaty. Obviously, it is hard for Kyrgyzstan to solve its security problems alone.

Tajikistan

State of Emergency Suspended for By-Elections

LD1006144193 Dushanbe Radio Dushanbe Network in Tajik 1200 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Text] The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Tajikistan has issued a decree on temporarily suspending the state of emergency in a number of rayons of the Republic of Tajikistan.

The decree says in part: In order to organize elections of the people's deputies of the Republic of Tajikistan in a number of constituencies to replace deputies who have

left, and in order to ensure the necessary conditions for the electorate to freely express their will, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Tajikistan resolves:

1) The state of emergency should be temporarily suspended from 0000 hours to 2400 hours on 13 June 1993 in the following rayons and cities of the republic: The Oktyabr and Frunze rayons of the city of Dushanbe; the city of Kurgan-Tyube; and the Bakhtar, Jilikul, and Kuybyshev rayons of Khatlon Oblast and (Farkhar) rayon.

2) The executive committees of the soviets of people's deputies of the cities and rayons that have been mentioned in the first article of this decree should adopt the necessary measures in order to peacefully organize the elections of the people's deputies of the Republic of Tajikistan in the relevant constituencies.

3) This decree will come into force from the date issued.

Armenia

Russian Delegation's Visit Detailed

NC1006181693 Yerevan Radio Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1530 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Text] Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev and Security Minister Viktor Barannikov arrived in Yerevan yesterday for a brief working visit. The delegation also included Major General Boris Gromov, Russia's first deputy defense minister; Deputy Foreign Minister Boris Pastukhov; Vladimir (Shlakhdin), deputy security minister and commander of the Russian border guards; the Russian mediator on Karabakh Vladimir Kazimirov; and other officials.

Armenian President Levon Ter-Petrosyan; Foreign Minister Vahan Papazyan; Davit Shakhnazaryan, the president's ambassador on special missions; and First Deputy Foreign Minister Zhirair Liparityan met Kozyrev, Barannikov, and Kazimirov at the government's reception house.

After meeting the Armenian leaders, Kozyrev, Barannikov, and Kazimirov met the representatives of Nagorno-Karabakh: Robert Kocharyan, chairman of the State Defense Committee of Nagorno- Karabakh Republic [NKR], and Georgiy Petrosyan, acting chairman of the NKR Supreme Soviet.

Afterward, Davit Shakhnazaryan told reporters the working visit was connected with the CSCE Minsk Group's proposal on halting the bloodshed in Nagorno-Karabakh and that this proposal is based on UN Security Council Resolution 822 and on the initiative of the Russian President Boris Yeltsin. The meeting discussed several concrete issues relating to the proposal. Yesterday, Armenia gave its positive reply to the initiative. Other issues pertaining to the bilateral interstate cooperation between Armenia and Russia were also discussed. Kozyrev, Barannikov, and Kazimirov met the NKR representatives Kocharyan and Petrosyan, when both sides assessed the proposal as a real opportunity that might lead to a positive result in terms of the cessation of fire and military operations in Nagorno-Karabakh. [15-second break in transmission] Azerbaijan has also replied positively to the initiative. No reply has come from the NKR, which has until 11 June to respond.

After the meeting, Ter-Petrosyan, Kozyrev, and Georgiy Petrosyan answered reporters' questions.

Ter-Petrosyan said it is too early to discuss results; they will emerge in the next few days.

Kozyrev said the meeting passed in a businesslike manner, allowing the opportunity to clarify several minor (?details) in the CSCE Minsk Group's initiative, and pointed to the mutual understanding between the two countries.

Georgiy Petrosyan said he was satisfied with the meeting and noted that the proposals are being studied.

Kozyrev Meets With Karabakh Officials

NC1006132793 Yerevan SNARK in English 1139 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Text] Yerevan, June 10 (SNARK)—As it was recently reported, Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev met Georgiy Petrosyan acting chairman of Karabakh parliament and Robert Kocharyan, Karabakh Defense State Committee chairman June 9 night. Trustworthy sources informed SNARK of the fact that during the meeting the Karabakh side expressed its view relating the new option of the "3+1" peaceful initiative. In particular, the schedule which, according to Karabakh officials, has not been changed from the last time just oversees troops bringing out of the Kelbadzharskiy region, and Karabakh officials underlined that there is lack of security guaranties for Karabakh people and no mechanism for control cease- fire as during the plan realization as well in the future. Karabakh leadership is anxious in connection with the present unstable situation in Azerbaijan what in it turn does not guarantee security for the agreement commitment by Azerbaijani authorities in the case mutual agreement is achieved. [sentence as received] In the conclusion Karabakh leaders said Karabakh is likely to give final response only after a detail discussion over the document proposed and after meeting with Russian foreign minister.

Foreign Minister To Address Athens NATO Conference

NC1006162093 Yerevan SNARK in English 1427 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Text] Yerevan, 10 Jun (SNARK)—Armenian Foreign Minister Vahan Papazyan would take part at the NATO countries foreign ministers conference in Athens. In the Armenian delegation are: Rafayel Babayan, chairman of the Armenian Parliamentary Commission on Human Rights and National Problems, and Arman Navasardyan, Armenian extraordinary and plenipotentiary ambassador to Vienna. Vahan Papazyan's speech would be on the conference agenda.

Russian Envoy Visits Armenian, Russian Border Guards

NC1006174793 Yerevan SNARK in English 1427 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Text] Yerevan, 10 June (SNARK)—Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Russian Ambassador to Armenia Vladimir Stupishin visited the Megrinskiy region of Armenian border to Iran. Armenian Defence Ministry informed SNARK's reporter the ambassador met Armenian and Russian border guard soldiers, and visited customs office at the Armenian-Iran border. The ambassador met Armenian State Minister [for developing south Armenia] Vazgen Sargisyan. Then visited Armenian church, talked to the local people. In the trip, Aleksandr Babenko, major general commander of the

Russian border guard troop in Armenia, and Grigor Grigoryan, head Armenian border commissar, escorted the ambassador.

Azerbaijan

Aliyev Reportedly Refuses Premiership

NC1006125293 Paris AFP in English 1230 GMT 10 Jun 93

[By Jean Raffaelli]

[Text] Baku, June 10 (AFP)—Former communist party boss Geydar Aliyev turned down an offer Thursday [10 June] by President Abulfaz Elchibey to head the government in Azerbaijan to resolve a crisis sparked by an armed rebellion in the country's second city.

The president's office announced Aliyev's refusal without giving any reasons. It added that negotiations to form a coalition government of national unity were continuing.

The TURAN news agency quoted sources close to the Azerbaijani leadership as saying that Aliyev had demanded full control over the government before he would accept the premier's post.

Aliyev, who rose to prominence under former Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev, and Elchibey, his long-time political rival, held all- night talks to try to solve the political crisis sparked by the take-over of Gyandzha by a rebel military unit.

But the offer to Aliyev was viewed by nationalist members of the Popular Front, Elchibey's power base in Azerbaijan, as a plot masterminded by Moscow to bring Baku's regime in line with Russian interests.

Government troops sent in to Gyandzha on June 4 to disarm the troops clashed with the military unit led by former defence minister and warlord Surat Guseynov, killing 69 people and injuring 200.

The renegades on Thursday continued to maintain control of Gyandzha and demanded the resignation of the president and of prime minister Panakh Guseynov who they charged were responsible for the bloodshed.

Isa Kamberov, speaker of the Milli Mejlis, an assembly established last year by Elchibey as the republic's working legislature, contends that the army rebellion coincided with the pull-out of a Russian army division from Gyandzha, which left behind a stockpile of weapons and armored vehicles.

Kamberov charged that any appointment of the 70-year-old Aliyev as prime minister and reconvening the communist-dominated parliament would amount to a "change of regime" in Baku, INTERFAX reported.

In a separate statement however, the presidential press service denied that Elchibey was ceding to demands of the old guard and stated that "attempts by the former party nomenklatura to use the events in Gyandzha to stage its return failed", ITAR-TASS reported.

Aliyev, was general secretary of the Azerbaijani communist party between 1969 and 1983 after heading the local arm of the KGB in the sixties.

He currently chairs the parliament of Nakhichevan, an autonomous Azeri republic sandwiched between Armenia, Iran and Turkey.

Officials in Baku said the situation remained calm in Gyandzha and that the rebel unit continued to hold hostage about 1,200 soldiers of the Azerbaijani National Guard as well as four senior government officials.

Guseynov, who led the insurgency, was sacked by Elchibey last February following several defeats in the war against Armenian units in Nagorno-Karabakh.

Aliyev's Rejection of Premiership Denied

LD1006150393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1444 GMT 10 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Viktor Shulman]

[Text] Baku June 10 TASS—Former communist boss of Azerbaijan Geydar Aliyev who is holding talks with President Abulfaz Elchibey did not reject the post of prime minister proposed to him, Gasan Zeynalov, representative of Nakhichevan in Baku told TASS by telephone on Thursday [10 June] denying mass media reports.

Guseynov's Supporters Demand Government Resignation

TA1106053993 Ankara TRT Television Network in Turkish 0500 GMT 11 Jun 93

[Text] A rally was held in Azerbaijan's Gyandzha town, which is under the control of former Army Corps Commander Surat Guseynov's supporters. The government was asked to resign within five days.

According to a report by the Azerbaijani-Turkish Agency, Guseynov also addressed the meeting. During the meeting, the government, which was held responsible for the Gyandzha incidents, was asked to resign by 15 June. In addition to the resignation of the government, the participants asked to convene the Supreme Soviet, punish those responsible for the Gyandzha incidents, and carry an uninterrupted live broadcast of the Milli Mejlis discussions on television.

Meanwhile, it has been reported that Nakhichevan Supreme Soviet Chairman Gaydar Aliyev asked for 24 hours to reply to Azerbaijani President Abulfaz Elchibey's proposal to assume the post of prime minister. The TURAN news agency reported that the talks between Elchibey and Aliyev are continuing and a meeting is scheduled for today.

Press Service Says Situation Stabilizing in Gyandzha

LD1006123093 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1116 GMT 10 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Sevindzh Abdullayev and Viktor Shulman]

[Text] Baku, 10 Jun—The situation in Azerbaijan, that had become exacerbated after the events in Gyandzha, is stabilizing, the press service of the president of the republic claims. A press release issued today through the channels of the Azerbaijani news agency says that "the attempt by the former party nomenklatura to use the Gyandzha tragedy for purposes of political revenge has failed."

According to the press service report, at the session of the republican National Assembly yesterday the leaders of those ministries with armed forces [silovyye ministerstva] and Azerbaijani Prime Minister Panakh Guseynov, gave "exhaustive and convincing" replies to deputies' questions regarding the events in Gyandzha. They gave an assurance that what happened in this town in western Azerbaijan was "the consequence of the refusal by the 709th Army unit, that supported Surat Gusyenov, former commander of the Corps of the National Army, to carry out the orders of the republican Defense Ministry." From a legal point of view, the press release stresses, "these actions are qualified as mutiny."

With the purpose of stabilizing the situation, by a decision of the National Assembly, a state deputies' investigation commission has been set up to investigate the tragedy in Gyandzha and a session is now underway in Baku. Consultations with the leaders of various political parties are also continuing here.

According to official statistics, industrial enterprises in the republic are working as normal and there has been no let-up in production since the events in Gyandzha began. In accordance with the state of emergency the presence of military servicemen in the streets of Baku continues to be stepped up and a curfew continues to operate throughout the republic.

The session of the National Assembly that had been switched to today will not take place.

Deputies Approve Amnesty Proposal for Gyandzha Participants

NC1006123693 Baku TURAN in English 1120 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Text] Baku, June 10 (TURAN)—At the evening setting of Milli Mejlis on June 9, deputies went on seeking the way out of the political crisis.

On the proposal of the former Prime-Minister P. Guseynov, the deputies accepted the project of the decree of amnesty of all the participants of the armed conflict June 4-6 in Gyandzha.

In the speeches of the ministers of defence, national security and the secretary of state an idea that the report of the deputate committee, that visited Gyandzha, was unobjective and based on occasional and unproved facts, was expressed. It was proposed to establish a new committee of 7 people and send it to Gyandzha. After the discussion, the deputies affirmed the stuff of the commission of 7 people headed by Matlab Mutalibov, the lawyer and the member of Milli Mejlis.

The leader of the opposition Etibar Mamedov said at the setting, that the present situation is a direct consequence of the actions of the present authorities. To Mamedov's words, the leadership of the Republic had drafted a plan on disarmament of the military units, loyal to S. Guseynov, but this plan had failed. Numerous victims and deep political crisis are the result of this shady enterprise. Mamedov stated, that the leadership of Azerbaijan have to resign.

APF Supporters Release Deputies Held in Parliament Building

NC1006124693 Baku TURAN in English 1120 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Text] Baku, June 10 (TURAN)—Blockaded parliament APF [Azerbaijan People's Front] supporters kept the deputies in the parliament building till late at night. The decision to blockade the building was accepted when extremist APF members called upon the participants of the rally to take a number of deputies as hostages. According to APF supporters view, former communists in the person of some deputies are connected with Suret Guseynov and they can be exchanged with Gyandzha hostages. When the Chairman of the Parliament Isa Kamberov threatened to resign immediately, the rally participants let the deputies out of the building.

The appeal to take the deputies as hostages was heard on the square in front of the parliament when the APF Executive Committee Chairman Farazh Guliyev accused a number of deputies in close relation with Surat Guseynov.

United Nations Resolution 822 Viewed

NC1006174093 Baku ASSA-IRADA in English 1336 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Text] Baku, 10 Jun (ASSA-IRADA)—Letter of Mario Rafaelli does not coincide with a new schedule of immediate measures on the UNSC 822 Resolution fulfillment. The new schedule has no item providing the Azerbaijani lifting of the blockade from Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh, ASSA-IRADA was told by the Azeri president plenipotentiary at the negotiations on Nagorno-Karabakh conflict Asim Mollazade. It's natural as there is no blockade at all. Meanwhile the data received from the competent sources say the letter of CSCE Minsk Group Chairman Rafaelli in regard to the peaceful plan does have such an item, the letter proceeding the item on the Armenian withdrawal from Kelbadzharskiy.

Visiting Russian Deputies Discuss Ties, Convicted Soldiers

PM1006134793 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 10 Jun 93 First Edition p 7

[Arif Useynov report: "It Is Important To Consider Everything"]

[Text] The Azerbaijani press has assessed as extremely successful the Russian Supreme Soviet delegation's visit to Baku.

The Russian parliamentarians met with Azerbaijani Supreme Soviet Chairman Isa Gambarov, the leadership of the Foreign Ministry, parliamentary commissions, and law-enforcement organs.

They agreed to formulate a bilateral agreement to broaden interparliamentary cooperation, work out a mechanism for its implementation, establish collaboration at parliamentary committee and commission level, and create joint standing deputies' groups to coordinate lawmaking activity.

The Russian parliamentarians discussed with their Azerbaijani colleagues the fate of the six Russian servicemen convicted by military tribunal.

"Everything must be thoroughly investigated, at state and parliamentary level," A. Anikiyev, deputy chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, said. "That is also in Azerbaijan's interests. We took advantage of our visit to immediately start implementing Azerbaijani Parliament Speaker Isa Gambarov's proposal—for all the circumstances of the case to be studied by a joint parliamentary commission."

The Russian and Azerbaijani parliamentarians deemed it advisable to send a joint letter to Azerbaijani President Abulfaz Elchibey insistently requesting that he respond to the appeal for a pardon for the six former Russian Russian servicemen from the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, leaders of the Russian state, and the Russian public at large. Then all the details of this case can be studied calmly and more thoroughly taking all the nuances into consideration. The Russian parliamentarians' position was backed by their Azerbaijani colleagues.

Karabakh's Petrosyan Interviewed on 'Official' Position

PM1106085793 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 9 Jun 93 First Edition p 7

[Report by Karen Topchyan: "Karabakh's Position"]

[Text] Stepanakert—Georgiy Petrosyan, acting chairman of the Nagorno-Karabakh Republic Supreme Soviet, told our correspondent of the position of official Stepanakert on the Karabakh problem:

[Petrosyan] After the hardship last year, when part of our territory was lost, today there is a certain stabilization in the military, political, and economic spheres. The Nagorno-Karabakh Republic again controls most of the territory it had lost. Tens of thousands of people obliged to leave their native cities and villages last year are returning.

[Topchyan] What do you think of the Armenian-Azerbaijani war over Nagorno-Karabakh, now in its sixth year?

[Petrosyan] Very regrettably, there are certain newspaper cliches. There is no Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict, there is a Karabakh-Azerbaijani conflict in which there are two protagonists: Nagorno-Karabakh and Azerbaijan.

We agree at least today to sit at the negotiations table with Abulfaz Elchibey. But Azerbaijan, by blocking the actual recognition of the Nagorno-Karabakh Republic as a side in the conflict, is essentially cancelling out all our attempts to achieve peace through bilateral negotiations. That is why in this situation when the conflict has gone too far, we cannot do without mediators.

Naturally, Russia wants to restore peace on its borders. The political, geopolitical, and economic interests of the United States and Turkey in the Transcaucasus are also understandable. It is something else that troubles me—the subject position of official Ankara in the settlement of the conflict. The experience of the past year shows that Turkey's mediation is of a frankly pro-Azerbaijani nature. In this context I should like to see a more vigorous stance by Russia.

As for the joint initiative of Russia, the United States, and Turkey, we do not reject it but advocate a certain amendments and additional work to the schedule for halting hostilities. The Nagorno-Karabakh leadership believes that our defensive army's withdrawal from the controlled territory is possible only in the context of a general cease-fire and a full guarantee of our borders' safety.

Georgia

Kozyrev's Visit Fails To Halt Fighting in Abkhazia

LD1006133093 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 0400 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Excerpts] Our correspondent, Gela Kapanadze is on the telephone line from Sukhumi. What happened yesterday and how was the visit?

[Kapanadze] Sadly, yesterday was unfortunate for the population of Sukhumi. People thought that the Russian delegation's official visit to Sukhumi and Abkhazia would cool, at least temporarily, the Abkhaz separatists' aim of finally destroying their own town and making the Georgian population flee.

Sukhumi was bombed yesterday at 1320 [0920 GMT]. The enemy opened fire again at Sukhumi from howitzers and four shells exploded in the port and the lighthouse area. The central part of the town was damaged. At 1515 [1115 GMT] the enemy resumed bombing from Grad installations. Thirty shells exploded in the central part of the town and one civilian was wounded. Bombing lasted nearly an hour.

Incidentally, Georgia's air defense forces spotted Russian SU-25 planes above the town, which having carried out a reconnaissance flight, veered and flew in the direction of Gudauta. The last bombing started when the Russian official delegation arrived at the airport approximately at 2000 [1600 GMT]. This bombing was quite intensive although lasted only a short time. Fifteen Grad shells fell on different rayons of the town, several shells fell into the sea; one civilian was wounded. Incidentally, the Russian delegation that was expected in Sukhumi by 1800 [1400 GMT] was quite late from Gudauta and it [the Russian delegation] arrived in Sukhumi approximately at 2000.

The delegation was met by the Georgian leadership. A working meeting was held in the Cabinet of Ministers. Kozyrev said that while in Sukhumi, any kind of continuation of shelling, clashes and the bloodshed would not be tolerated any more. Russia's unconditional demand is working out the mechanism of the cease-fire. The agreement has already been reached with both the Georgian and Abkhaz sides, that on 11 June, the representatives of Georgia, Abkhazia, and Russia would start working on these mechanisms in Moscow. A delegation will be sent to Moscow for this purpose. [passage omitted]

Kozyrev literally said that Russia would not tolerate it any more. The side that did not cease-fire would not get anything from Russia, neither agreements or political treaties, oil or anything. On the contrary, the side that would adhere to the cease-fire agreement, would get everything. As for the time limit, when it should happen, Kozyrev said that it should happen in a week's time and as soon as the real mechanism of the cease-fire was worked out, then we could talk about a comprehensive, wide-scale agreement between Russia and Georgia. Kozyrev said that signing this agreement was Russia's aim.

According to Georgian representatives present at the negotiations, The Russian side was pushy during the talks, anyway this is what the members of the Georgian delegation, Tedo Paatashvili, and Boris Kakubava said. Sandro Kavsadze in his conversation with me said that practically nothing constructive had happened during this meeting.

It may be said that the Russian delegation's visit to Sukhumi was merely a formality as everything had practically been decided on the political scenes of Tbilisi and Gudauta.

Russian Security Minister Viktor Barannikov denied completely Russian soldiers' participation in the conflict in Abkhazia. By the way, the Russian side, touching on the demand of the Georgian side to withdraw military units from Eshera, reiterated that the withdrawal would only happen if the cease-fire were established.

According to Kozyrev and the Russian delegation in general, the negotiations are being drawn into a deadlock by the fact that the Abkhazians are demanding an unconditional withdrawal of Georgian Army units and the Georgians are insisting on restoring the Russian-Georgian border on the River Psou.

Mr. Tedo Paatashvili also said that the Russian side demanded the Russian Army be granted peacekeeping status. Only in this case, according to Paatashvili, would the cease-fire hold, and later on the UN observers would continue the work. This is what happened during the visit. I would like to reiterate that the Georgian side, those persons I talked to, were displeased because nothing constructive had been reached and everybody presumed that the firing would continue and it came true. Several shells were fired after Kozyrev's departure. This morning, according to our data, intensive shelling resumed. At 0415 [0015 GMT] clashes at River Gumista resumed. The Abkhaz side opened fire at 3rd subunit of tanks, infantry fighting vehicles, and mortars. This morning we contacted the Ochamchire headquarters and were told that shelling was being carried out in the territory of Labra and Tamishi. This is what the situation is like in Sukhumi. We shall see what will happen later on. We shall forward to you the materials from yesterday's news conference later on.

Abkhaz Leader: Russians 'Cannot Be Fully Trusted'

LD1106101693 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 0700 GMT 11 Jun 93

[Excerpts] Here is an interview with correspondent Gela Kapanadze in Sukhumi, which we received by telephone.

[Kapanadze] [passage omitted] Yesterday, Tamaz Nadareishvili, the chairman of the Abkhazian Defense Council and Council of Ministers, spoke on Abkhazian state television. He said that he is pleased with an official visit of the Russian delegation to Georgia and the Abkhazian region in particular. He said that despite this visit Russia remains an interested party, therefore it cannot be fully trusted and Georgian armed units will not relax their attention a minute from the military-strategic point of view.

Nadareishvili also stated that despite the fact that the Cabinet of Ministers is fully mobilized to achieve an honorable completion of the war, ways have been found to establish and enhance economic links. Banditism, looting and robbery rate has significantly diminished in the city. Electric power, although disconnected yesterday, has been, in principle, supplied to the city normally for the last 10 days. Bread is baked normally. A

peasants market functions properly and it seems to be the only market in Georgia where coupon and ruble ratio is one to one.

Shevardnadze Hints at 'Strong-Arm' Solution to Abkhazia

PM1006134593 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Jun 93 p 3

[Anatoliy Stasovskiy report: "Abkhazia: Again Shooting, Again Fighting. Russian-Georgian Talks Will Take Place Under Sign of Intensifying Georgian-Abkhaz Conflict"]

[Excerpts] A Russian delegation headed by Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev flew to Tbilisi 9 June. During the talks with the Georgian leadership it is proposed to analyze the development of the situation since the 14 May consultative working meeting in Moscow between Russian President Boris Yeltsin and Eduard Shevardnadze, chairman of parliament and head of state of the Republic of Georgia, and to discuss the status of the Russian troops in Georgia and problems of settling the Georgian-Abkhaz conflict. In addition to Tbilisi, the delegation plans to visit Sukhumi and Gudauta. [passage omitted]

Eduard Shevardnadze, chairman of the Georgian parliament, who has been in Sukhumi during these days, has declared that the republic's armed forces possess sufficient forces and means to conduct not only defensive operations. To all appearances, a transparent allusion was made to the fact that Georgia might at any moment embark on resolving the problem of the Georgian-Abkhaz conflict by means of strong-arm methods.

This version was also reinforced by Eduard Shevardnadze's speech on Georgian television. In particular, while not ruling out peaceful means of resolving the conflict, he emphasized that it is necessary to have several strong subunits in Sukhumi (perhaps it is a question of transferring there units of the "White Eagle" rapid reaction corps), and if the Abkhaz side does not cease aggressive actions, then Georgia will have to think not only of defense....

As regards the upcoming Russian-Georgian talks, they will certainly not be easy. This can be assumed on the grounds, for example, that the talks will start against the background of a new spiral of tension in the Georgian-Abkhaz conflict, the ambivalent attitude in Georgia toward Russian servicemen, the complex situation in the western part of the republic, where armed detachments of the Kobaliya brothers, supporters of Zviad Gamsakhurdia, are still operating, and the very complex economic situation in the country.

Shevardnadze Directive on Armed Forces

AU1106101693 Tbilisi SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA in Georgian 28 May 93 p 3

["Directive of the Georgian Head of State on the Elaboration and Implementation of a Military Construction Program for the Republic of Georgia"]

[Text] In spite of Georgia's serious economic situation, the process of creating a national army is under way. Recently, in order to create a national army, a young, energetic active fighting generation has come into the system of the Republic of Georgia Ministry of Defense and requires the support of the Georgian Parliament, Cabinet of Ministers, ministries and departments, and all citizens.

The creation of a single well-armed army in the republic is a most important state task in whose implementation every citizen, family, and the entire population in the republic should participate.

Proceeding from the aforementioned:

1. The Republic of Georgia Ministry of Defense together with the apparatus of the commander in chief of the Republic of Georgia Armed Forces are to elaborate and present within ten days to the Georgian head of state-commander in chief of the Armed Forces a Republic of Georgia amended draft military doctrine and program for the military construction of the Armed Forces, in whose elaboration qualified military specialists and regular and retired officers and generals are to be actively involved and foreign specialists and their experience are to be widely used.

These drafts should correspond to the national interests of the Republic of Georgia and should fully comply with all the requirements made of the Republic of Georgia as a member state of both the UN and the CSCE in accordance with international agreements.

2. During the creation and formation of the Armed Forces, the Republic of Georgia ministries of defense and internal affairs are to pay particular attention to bringing up to strength officer personnel in military units and establishments with qualified cadres and their correct selection and placement and professional training in accordance with their position. With this aim, they are to elaborate a complex of measures aimed at forming an officer corps in the Republic of Georgia Armed Forces and introduce such special structures of orientation and indoctrination as a cadet corps, middle and senior level officer schools, a military academy, military postgraduate study, and so forth. They are to study and apply on a wide scale the experience of training officer cadres in foreign armies.

3. In connection with the departure of Russian Federation border troops from the territory of the Republic of Georgia, a subject of particular concern for and the primary task of all ranking officers should be the creation of Georgian border troops within the shortest period of

time and their subsequent strengthening and improvement. The newly created national border troops should ensure the inviolability of the borders of the Republic of Georgia on land, sea, lakes, and rivers.

4. The Scientific and Technical and Industrial Commission attached to the Georgian head of state-commander in chief of the Armed Forces together with the Republic of Georgia Ministry of Defense, the Republic of Georgia Scientific and Technical Committee, and the Georgian Academy of Sciences are to elaborate and submit within one month:

a) Republic of Georgia ministerial and departmental purposive programs for the creation and development of a material and technical base for the Republic of Georgia Ministry of Defense, the production of weapons and combat materials, the procurement of spare parts for vehicles, and carrying out the repair of existing combat equipment in the Armed Forces.

b) A draft plan for scientific-research work connected with military-defense measures.

5. The Republic of Georgia ministries of defense and internal affairs together with the Republic of Georgia chief military procurator and the Georgian parliamentary corresponding standing commissions are to discuss and present within one month to the Georgian head of state-commander in chief of the Armed Forces proposals for a radical restructuring of the whole system of indoctrination work in the Republic of Georgia Armed Forces and strengthening military discipline and reinforcing the struggle for lawfulness.

The best historical Georgian military traditions and instillation in servicemen of the highest combat aspirations, discipline, and the ability to sacrifice oneself in the name and honor of one's motherland should form the basis for the process of indoctrination in the Republic of Georgia Armed Forces.

6. In order to better prepare young students in the Republic of Georgia for military service in the Armed Forces, improve their physical training, and prepare them for combat readiness, the Republic of Georgia Cabinet of Ministers is to discuss anew and over a period of one month the question of the initial military training of students in Republic of Georgia secondary schools and professional and technical and specialized secondary institutions as a state subject and the restoration of the component in the system of preparing young students for defending their motherland and its future improvement.

The Republic of Georgia ministries of defense and education together with other ministries and departments that are concerned with the education of young people are to elaborate a complex of measures aimed at instilling in the younger generation a sense of patriotism and responsibility for protecting the Republic's interests from the moment their studies begin.

As a result of undergoing initial military training, each young person should acquire the ability to overcome difficulties in Army life and the desire and aim to serve with pride in the ranks of the National Army and recognize the necessity of defending the motherland as the holiest duty before the land of Georgia and the memory of his ancestors.

7. To create in the structures of the Republic of Georgia Ministry of Defense an information service (press center) equipped with the appropriate apparatus that will ensure the dissemination of military information and will carry out military censorship. At the same time, this service, in close contact with the mass media and the Georgian Television and Radio Corporation, will provide propaganda relating to the military organizational development of the Republic of Georgia Armed Forces, the Republic of Georgia Law "on Universal Military Service Obligation," and military service and will shed light on questions pertaining to the military patriotic indoctrination of young people, their preparation for military service, and service in the ranks of the Republic's Armed Forces.

8. The Republic of Georgia Cabinet of Ministers together with the Republic of Georgia ministries of finance, defense, and internal affairs are to elaborate and present within one month to the Georgian head of state-commander in chief of the Armed Forces proposals concerning a significant increase in pay for all categories of servicemen. In spite of the current serious economic situation in the Republic, servicemen should become the most well- off section of the population.

9. The Republic of Georgia Cabinet of Ministers together with the Republic of Georgia ministries of defense, internal affairs, finance, health protection, and social security, labor, and employment are to elaborate and present within one month to the Georgian head of state-commander in chief of the Armed Forces:

a) A plan of measures for providing the family members of combatants killed, wounded, and disabled in battles for Georgian freedom and independence with pensions and material assistance. At the same time, they are to take into account that the size of the pensions and assistance should be determined so as to ensure a normal standard of living and conditions for these people.

b) Proposals for opening additional specialized clinics for the rehabilitation, adaptation, and future treatment of those wounded and disabled, the creation of a rehabilitation center, and favorable conditions for their treatment. With this aim, to consider it expedient to create an emergency headquarters in the Republic of Georgia Ministry for Health Protection that will provide for the future treatment of the wounded, ensure the supply of medicines and, if necessary, will send qualified medical specialists to the place requested.

c) A plan of measures aimed at creating a special reserve of medicines in the system of the Republic of Georgia Ministry of Defense for the wounded and disabled.

Particular attention is to be given to accumulating vital medicines necessary for saving the lives of those wounded, anesthetics and painkillers, a wide range of antibiotics, blood for transfusions, and sterilizing agents.

10. To create in the Republic of Georgia ministries and departments and cities and rayons special commissions headed by ministers, departmental chiefs, city mayors, city and rayon gamgeoba [board of administration] chairmen. To entrust these commissions with: finding work for combatants returning from the war, organizing their future medical treatment, providing them with every kind of assistance, and opening special courses for retraining these combatants so that they can acquire a new profession. The state should take upon itself all care of disabled combatants.

11. The Republic of Georgia Ministry of Defense is to carry out work on aesthetically designing the uniforms of servicemen that should include the national state emblems. The Georgian military uniform should be modern and attractive, one that emphasizes the dignity and glory of the serviceman in the Republic of Georgia Armed Forces.

12. The Republic of Georgia Cabinet of Ministers is to implement measures aimed at the future improvement of civil defense as an integral part of the system of national defense measures.

The Republic of Georgia civil defense administrative body—the Republic of Georgia Rescue Corps—is to be in direct charge of ensuring the protection of the Georgian population from the consequences of large-scale industrial accidents, catastrophes, and natural and ecological disasters and damage to the environment.

13. I express the firm belief that Georgian scientists, writers, and journalists will actively comment on questions relating to the organizational development of the National Armed Forces in the Republic and on the worthy defenders of the motherland who are standing guard over the preservation of Georgia's territorial integrity and, with gun in hand, are protecting its freedom and independence and will devote themselves to their works in which they will describe their heroic deeds.

[Signed] Eduard Shevardnadze

Secret Service Wants International Cooperation

LD1006154793 Tbilisi CONTACT INFORMATION AGENCY in Russian 1433 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Text] [no dateline as received] The Information and Intelligence Service of the Republic of Georgia has denied the rumors disseminated by the Abkhazian side about the existence of a cooperation agreement between the Georgian and Ukrainian intelligence services and made a strong protest to the Gudauta leadership.

At the same time, the Information and Intelligence Service of the Republic of Georgia expresses its readiness to establish businesslike contacts with intelligence services of various countries. Such cooperation will envisage exchanging information on illegal activities, conducting joint operations, etc.

South Ossetian Leaders Urge Reunification With North

MK1006110093 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 10 Jun 93 p 3

[Liana Minasyan report under "South Ossetia" rubric: "Tskhinvali Warns: There Must Be No Borders Between Two Ossetias"]

[Text] South Ossetian leaders on 9 June, the day when Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev began his visit to Georgia, deemed it necessary to state their attitude on the territorial problem connected with the need to delimit the border between Russia and Georgia (this question is to be included in a pending interstate treaty). "If Georgia and Russia want to draw the boundary along the "lines" of the former USSR, we shall do everything to prevent this from happening," said Alan Chochiyev, deputy chairman of the South Ossetian Supreme Soviet. "There has been and must be no border between North and South Ossetia."

He stated that on the issue of borders South Ossetia and Abkhazia have a common political position, citing a joint statement by these republics on their incorporation into Russia (according to his more accurate wording, "an overwhelming number of Abkhaz and Ossetian people" want to join Russia since it is impossible to hold a referendum in Abkhazia with predictable results owing to a "demographic imbalance.").

According to Chochiyev, South Ossetia has overcome the political inertia connected with a clearly pro-Moscow orientation, and can now rely only on itself. As for contacts with Tbilisi, in the last year and a half there have been five meetings of representatives, but they did not discuss political questions and neither is this planned for the future.

For his part, South Ossetian Premier Oleg Teziyev believes that the conflict has passed from a military "phase" into an economic one and that the breakdown of banking links and the cutting off of South Ossetia's financial system from Russia's must have been initiated by Moscow. Incidentally, the first border and customs post has also appeared on Russian territory, in the North Ossetian settlement of Buron. According to the premier, this follows a directive by the Russian Defense Ministry, which is forming the structures of new border military districts. After several demarches the number of border guards has been reduced, and they are now behaving "quietly," without carrying out searches or inspection of documents—although the mere fact that the post has appeared at all is a source of much concern to the South Ossetians.

Ossetia, according to Teziyev, is not capable of restoring the economy on its own. This has brought about a deterioration in the domestic situation, including the crime situation: The government cannot provide jobs for the people. Teziyev believes that the reason for this is the republic's uncertain status. The political prospects for South Ossetia, its leaders believe, were defined at the second national congress. The congress of the Ossetian people, which took place in May in Vladikavkaz, decided to hold a nationwide referendum on the unification of the Ossetian people and to create a Styr Nykhas—a kind of "public parliament," which would include representatives of the two Ossetias. The official structures for their part formed a group of 16 people including leaders of the republics (Chochiyev described it as an "interrepublican parliament") which would ensure their socioeconomic integration.

Part of the national movement supports the idea of a united and independent Ossetia, but politically it is unfeasible.

Estonia

Talks With Russia Assessed; Gas Accord Initialed

WS0906094693 Tallinn BNS in English 0759 GMT 9 Jun 93

[Text] Moscow, June 08, BNS—The heads of the Estonian and Russian delegations were diverse in assessing the process of bilateral negotiations while speaking in a press conference after the 12th round of talks which ended in Nakhabino near Moscow today.

The head of the Russian delegation, Vasiliy Svirin, commenting on the process of talks, told reporters he was "far from optimism", while his Estonian counterpart Juri Luik spoke in more positive terms, calling the talks "fruitful".

Svirin said that in his opinion, progress can be observed only in talks over issues, finding a positive solution to which is above all of Estonia's advantage. But talks over issues which Russia considers of major importance have been frozen, he added.

Luik said his optimism was first of all due to the fact that the two countries are continuing the process of negotiations. "If the relations won't deteriorate, then even with this one can be satisfied," Luik said in the press conference. "As long as we calmly speak with each other, there are grounds for optimism," he added.

The delegations in the 12th round of talks initialed an agreement on trade and economic relations between Estonia and Russia for 1993, and also "Effectively concluded" discussion of a draft agreement on social security guarantees for the Russian military and their family members on the Estonian territory.

The first document says that both sides are free to establish joint ventures on each other's territory, Luik told BNS. But he added that certain problems still existed in this field for the time being.

The agreement initialed today prohibits Russia from imposing restrictions on exports of natural gas to Estonia. Russia at present accounts for 100 percent of Estonia's imports of natural gas.

The document doesn't contain an indicative list of goods and commodities that the two countries would supply each other with. "We only agreed that the parties won't impose restrictions on bilateral trade," Luik added. Trade between the two countries will be based on world market prices.

Humanitarian issues were left out from the past round of talks for "purely technical" reasons, the chief negotiators said. Svirin said respective groups of experts from both countries are scheduled to meet in Tallinn on June 15-16.

The issue of the state border continues to be critical in the process of the talks. The head of the Russian delegation said a package of agreements about the border remains frozen by the Estonian side. Luik, accordingly, said the border issue remains "one of the most important ones in the negotiations".

The following round of talks is scheduled to take place in Estonia's western seaside resort of Parnu on July 7-8.

Luik To Raise Territorial Issue With Russia

MK1006105093 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 10 Jun 93 p 3

[Interview with Juri Luik, head of delegation to talks with Russia, by Vitaliy Portnikov under the "Talks" rubric; place and date not given: "Delegations of Russia and Estonia Will Have To Discuss Territorial Issues. Head of Estonian Delegation Juri Luik Thinks They Are Purely Legal"]

[Text] [Portnikov] One may suppose that the Estonian side will continue to insist that territorial questions be discussed as part of the Russian-Estonian talks agenda. How do your Russian negotiating partners react to such demands?

[Luik] They have always been saying that "we are not returning any territories even to the Japanese. What do you want then?" But as we see it, the problem lies first and foremost in where the border between Russia and Estonia is after all? Both Estonian and Russian border guards can confirm that there is simply no such line today. There used to be an internal border line between the republics of the Soviet Union. The line remains unmarked to this day. Taking a walk there, you can freely move in both directions. As for the question: "Where should the border run?"—we give different answers.

[Portnikov] Is it true that former citizens of the Estonian Republic who now live in rayons that are now part of the Russian Federation may regain their citizenship?

[Luik] This is a purely legal problem. Russian and Estonian legislation does not allow dual citizenship unless there is a special treaty to this effect. Thus, all these people really have Russian passports. That region is rather difficult. And to be an Estonian there actively and openly is rather hard. But in principle, if they would like to, they can receive an Estonian passport. They can also receive dual citizenship even under our legislation because it is owing to the force of circumstances that they had received citizenship of another country.

[Portnikov] What is your objective at possible talks on territorial questions—to get territories returned, or simply see that the fact of their annexation is recognized and let the status quo continue?

[Luik] We proposed that Russia recognize the existence of the Tartu peace and the problems that arose after the occupation of Estonia by the Soviet Union in 1940. We

said that it would be easier for us, from a purely legal point of view, to find some sensible compromises. Indeed, as far as we are concerned the Estonian Republic existed all these decades on the basis of law. We had nothing else. Which is why we are very much given to legal problems. For us this question is first and foremost legal rather than purely material.

[Portnikov] Estonian Prime Minister Mart Laar came out with a statement recently on the need for support to Finno-Ugric peoples and republics of the Russian Federation by the Finno-Ugric states. Is Estonia really ready to play a role in this on an international scale?

[Luik] In this issue Estonia primarily perceives cultural affinity—this is rather far removed from politics. They sometimes say that once Finno-Ugric peoples have reached strong self-awareness, they would somehow destroy Russia. But I do not think this is very serious. The most important thing would be a possibility for these peoples to protect their culture. I do not hide the fact though that since Russia is taking a very active interest in human rights in Estonia, so too will we be taking interest in human rights in Russia.

Comments on Talks

LD1006155293 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 1200 GMT 10 Jun 93

[Interview with Juri Luik, minister without portfolio and head of the talks with Russia, by unidentified correspondent at the Tallinn airport upon his return from Estonian-Russian talks in Moscow—live or recorded]

[Excerpt] [Correspondent] In addition to official talks, you also met Anatoliy Adamishin, Russian deputy foreign minister. What was discussed at your meeting?

[Luik] We discussed the results of the talks and also this activeness on the part of Russia regarding withdrawing its troops as soon as possible. As you know, the Russian side emphasized during the talks—and Adamishin confirmed this—that the issue has to do first and foremost with finances and requested us to use the channels available to us to find certain funds so that officers who are still on Estonian territory could be quickly housed. And even though they categorically refused to present at last a final deadline for the troop withdrawal, one can sense that there are plans to do so and there is a willingness to do so.

At a request from Mr. Adamishin, we also touched upon Estonian domestic legislation. I could not in any way say that the Russian deputy foreign minister was particularly pleased with our law on elections to local councils. He criticized it quite sharply. We, however, agreed that this is a domestic Estonian matter, and the Russian side will naturally have to take this into account. [passage omitted]

Ship Carrying Israeli Arms Arrives at Tallinn Port

TA0806144993 Tel Aviv HA'ARETZ in Hebrew 8 Jun 93 p A7

["Exclusive" report from Copenhagen by Eliyahu Zehavi]

[Text] A cargo ship loaded with Israeli-made weapons has arrived at the Tallinn port of Estonia. Estonian press, which has been widely covering this story, reported that the $50-million arms deal was signed in January 1993, but Israel has asked that it is not made public before the first shipment arrives at the Tallinn port.

The papers reported that Estonia signed an arms deal with the Israel Military Industries. According to the reports, the deal includes missile systems, antiaircraft guns, rocket launchers, submachine guns, hand guns, and ammunition. A live demonstration of the Israeli arms was held at the central base of the Estonian Army. The show was attended by Prime Minister Mart Laar, Defense Minister Rebas Hain, and Chief of Staff Antas Laankots [name as published].

The Estonian prime minister's adviser told the newspaper POSTIMEES that the purchase of arms in Israel is a breakthrough for Estonia because it enables it to purchase arms that correspond with NATO standards, after being dependent on Soviet arms in the past. According to the adviser, this is a first of its kind purchase in scope and quality.

The adviser added that Western countries have so far refused to sell arms to Estonia, due to its delicate political situation—a hint at the tension between Estonia and Russia.

New Border Guard Chief Appointed

LD0806161293 Tallinn Radio Estonia in Estonian 1400 GMT 8 Jun 93

[Text] Justice Minister Kaido Kama who is standing in for the interior minister, signed an order today that appoints Tarmo Kouts the new director general of the Border Guard Department. Up until now he had been rector of Tallinn Maritime Education College. As is known, Andrus Oovel who was director general of the Border Guard Department, had been retired on orders from the interior minister.

Latvia

Government To Wait on Purchasing Israeli Arms

WS0206130493 Tallinn BNS in English 1200 GMT 1 Jun 93

[Text] Riga, June 01, BNS—Latvia will not buy weapons from Israel for the time being, the Latvian Defense Council decided at a closed-doors meeting Monday [31 May].

At first, related officials will find out what and how much military equipment is needed for the country's defense. Then, they will report to the Saeima that will further coordinate the purchase of weapons.

The information was confirmed by head of the parliamentary defense committee Peteris Simsons, who said that Latvia can afford to buy weapons neither from Israel nor from Russia for the presently allotted sums in the state budget. Simsons also denied a possibility that Latvia might purchase any weapons through private mediator firms.

Russia Said Reluctant To Turn Over Military Housing

WS0906094493 Tallinn BNS in English 0759 GMT 9 Jun 93

[Text] Riga, June 08, BNS—Russian officials balked at chances to handover military housing Latvian authorities, as required by laws, Ilgonis Upmalis, head of the bureau monitoring the Russian troops withdrawal, told BNS.

All the houses constructed by the former Soviet Union's Defense Ministry after 1940 are now the property of the Republic of Latvia under a Latvian Land Act that became effective April 5, Upmalis said.

The deadlock situation with housing units serves as a basis for conflicts and misunderstandings between Russian and Latvian military, he said.

Recently, Russia's Northwestern Army Commander Leonid Mayorov directed a letter to Latvian parliament Chair Anatolijs Gorbunovs protesting the "uncivilized approach" toward property problems exposed by the Latvian military.

The Latvian Home Guards and the national military were accused by the Russia army of arbitrarily occupying homes left by Russian military in the Purvciems residential district of Riga. Such cases have a tendency to become more frequent, a press release says.

Janis Kina, a senior Latvian Air Force official, said that there were two such cases when Latvian air force officers moved in vacated flats in Purvciems. They occupied the flats before the local governments had officially taken over the homes. Latvian officers have priority right to be in the homes of repatriated Russian military, in compliance with a Latvian government resolution of 1991.

The Latvian Home Guard has no information about the Home Guards' alleged participation in the event.

Foreign Minister Leaves for Athens Conference

LD0906175293 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian 1700 GMT 9 Jun 93

[Excerpt] Foreign Minister Georgs Andrejevs and (Juris Kanelis), deputy secretary of state, left for Greece this afternoon to participate in a conference of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council, which will take place in Athens 10-12 June. The minister will make a speech there. It will be mainly devoted to the Russian Army withdrawal and peacekeeping issues. [passage omitted]

Belarusian Envoy Presents Credentials to Gorbunovs

WS1006095793 Tallinn BNS in English 1821 GMT 9 Jun 93

[Text] Riga, June 09, BNS—Ambassador Valentin Valichko of the Republic of Belarus presented his credentials Wednesday [9 June] to Latvian parliament chairman Anatolijs Gorbunovs.

The newly accredited ambassador described his meeting with Gorbunovs as constructive. The officials are said to have discussed several topics important to both countries' cooperation.

Latvia and Belarus concluded a friendship and cooperation pact in April 1991; they have also signed transportation agreements.

Latvia has acknowledged Belarusian property rights on the Belarusija sanatorium in Jurmala. The sanatorium caters to those affected by the Chernobyl atomic pile catastrophe.

Velichko says that the visa regime issue between Latvia and Belarus can be considered after fixing the state border between the two countries.

Belarus also wants to cooperate with Latvia in the fishing industry and in sailing.

Lithuania

Russia's Grachev Demands Compensation for Army Property

WS1006113493 Vilnius LIETUVOS AIDAS in Lithuanian 19 May 93 No. 94 p 5

[Article by Arminas Norkus: "Grachev Comes for the Debt"]

[Text] Everything is changing so fast these days. Only a year ago, Lithuania did not even think that it would have to pay some mysterious debt to the occupationist Army. At that time, the Ostankino and Russian television stations, speaking about the negotiations between Russia and Lithuania on the withdrawal of the Soviet Army, would mention the greatest obstacle—Lithuania's demand for compensation for the damage done by the Army over 50 years of occupation. Their argument was that it was the Soviet Union that had occupied Lithuania, and that Russia had nothing to do with this. Russia did not want to remember that it had declared itself the USSR's successor. It may have wanted to inherit only rights rather than commitments.

On Monday [17 May], Russian and Ostankino televisions announced that during his visit to Lithuania Russian Defense Minister Pavel Grachev would discuss compensation for the military property the Army was leaving behind. There is no more talk about the compensation that Lithuania was going to demand from Russia. Everything has turned upside down: It is Lithuania that is indebted to Russia today. Currently, the robber is demanding a reward, and he may receive it.

What makes this possible?

Recent events demonstrate this. Some top Lithuanian officials look Moscow in the mouth before doing or saying something (to put it mildly, the rude ones speak about another part of the body). Examples are more than plentiful.

The northwestern group of the Russian Army holds exercises during which it practices the occupation of the Baltic states within 48 hours. While Latvia and Estonia protest this, Lithuanian authorities and military officials keep silent, as though their lips were sealed. It is difficult to understand why the Lithuanian Army holds simultaneous drills. Are our commanders preparing to defend the country from their eastern neighbor, or are they marching hand in hand with Moscow? (Different rumors are spreading already.) Suppose nothing happened, and our military simply did not know what the Russian operations units were doing here. However, it could have at least supported Latvia and Estonia. Since our authorities did not do anything, this means that they either backed Moscow's actions or did not oppose them.

Here is another example of kowtowing to Moscow. A Lithuanian representative (incidentally, the chairman of the LDLP [Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party] Seimas faction) returns from the European Council and begins to relate that Latvia was not admitted to this organization because it violates human rights and has discriminatory laws. Listening to such explanations, one begins to wonder: What has happened? Has Europe begun to reiterate the words of Moscow's most ardent imperialists? Nothing of the sort. It turns out that the European Council's opinion on human rights in Latvia (and in Estonia, where the citizenship law is stricter) was that even some Western countries could envy their situation. The reason is simple—Latvia will be admitted after the free elections. Moreover, Russia, which has also applied for the European Council membership, must meet the same requirement.

It becomes clear at last that only Lithuanians are dancing to the tune of the Russian imperialists. One can only admire Russia's insight: The interstate agreement was not signed last September, as if Russia had known that power would be assumed by those who do not demand debts, but pay them themselves.

Grachev told a press conference on Monday: "The aim of my visit to Lithuania is the withdrawal of the Russian Army, compensation for the property it is leaving here, and the signing of the interstate agreement that regulates these issues. I will ask Lithuanian President A. Brazauskas and Defense Minister A. Butkevicius to speed up the preparation of this agreement."

Grachev is hastily milking money from the current Lithuanian Government.

Is the latter really so heavily indebted?

Russian Troops Said Getting Serious About Withdrawal

LD0806144893 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Russian 1200 GMT 8 Jun 93

[Text] It has been felt of late that the Russian servicemen have really gotten down to business. They have realized at last that they will have to leave the territory of Lithuania by 31 August; therefore no artificial obstacles are being created.

Such a point of view was expressed in the daily RESPUBLIKA by Colonel Stasys Knezys, chief of staff of the National Defense Ministry and the person authorized by the Government of the Republic of Lithuania on the matters concerning the withdrawal of the Russian troops from Lithuania. The person authorzed by the Lithuanian Government admitted that sometimes the authorities of Lithuania put spokes in the wheels themselves, in particular the cries and accusations of politicians that began when permission was granted to introduce an additional quantity of unarmed servicemen for the acceleration of the work of packing. Either these politicians do not understand what they are talking about, or they are interested in having the Russian troops remain in Lithuania as long as possible, Mr. Knezys said.

According to Stasys Knezys, the statements voiced by the politicians that Russia owes Lithuania hundreds of billions of U.S. dollars for the inflicted ecological damage sound rather attractive. However, he said that Lithuania would not receive a penny, and it was their own fault. The government failed to set up working expert groups together with Russia. It also failed to find the money to carry out the ecological examination, Colonel Stasys Knezys said.

Lalumiere on Country's Admission to European Council

WS0806132693 Vilnius LIETUVOS AIDAS in Lithuanian 14 May 93 No. 91 p 1

[Interview with Catherine Lalumiere, secretary general of the Council of Europe, by Aurimas Drizius in Strasbourg on 13 May: "The Council of Europe: Estonia Will Follow Lithuania. Kozyrev's Letter Aroused the Wish to Admit Estonia to the EC as Soon as Possible"]

[Text] Today, on 14 May, at 0815 local time, a ceremony to admit three new members—Lithuania, Estonia, and Slovenia—will begin at the Council of Europe headquarters in Strasbourg. The flags of these three countries will be hoisted outside. At 1000, Lithuanian Seimas

Chairman C. Jursenas will address the assembly of the Council of Europe Parliament.

On the eve of this festivity, Catherine Lalumiere, secretary general of the Council of Europe, answered a few questions from LIETUVOS AIDAS.

[Drizius] Lithuania will be admitted to the Council of Europe. What does this mean to ordinary Lithuanians?

[Lalumiere] Lithuania's admission to the Council of Europe is the result of long work and consultations. This is only the first step. Lithuania will continue to move toward democracy. At the same time, this event symbolizes that Lithuania is a democratic country. This, of course, does not mean that the inhabitants of Vilnius will begin living in a paradise the next day. It will take you many years to create material wealth.

[Drizius] In what spheres of the Council of Europe's activities could Lithuanian parliament members participate?

[Lalumiere] Lithuania is already working in the Council of Europe commissions. Since Lithuania was occupied for several decades, I believe that it could act as a consultant for the people of the oppressed nations.

[Drizius] What is the role of journalists in expanding the activities of the Council of Europe?

[Lalumiere] The role of the free press is much more important in the countries that are transforming on the democratic basis than in those with longstanding democratic traditions. Your journalists must be objective, accurate, educated, and they must honor human rights.

Yesterday, the assembly session of the Council of Europe Parliament debated Estonia's application. There were opinions that Russia would be against this. However, objecting voices were drowned in the sea of approving applause. Thirty deputies and guests spoke at the session. The Swedes, Finns, and Norwegians supported Estonia and discussed the letter by Russian Foreign Minister A. Kozyrev, in which he requested the Council of Europe to suspend Estonia's admission. Tarshys from Sweden called it "the most unproductive letter in the history of diplomacy." Pole Bender was even more poignant. According to him, Kozyrev's letter was the interference in Estonia's internal affairs, if not a provocation. Bender said categorically in conclusion: "I request that Estonia be admitted to the Council of Europe no later than today." Ms. Fleetwood from Sweden recalled the situation how after World War II the waves had brought an empty barge floating to her village on the seashore. There was no one inside except some children's clothes and burning candles. According to her, that was the barge of war refugees from the Baltics. However, no one could tell how its passengers had perished. Fleetwood said that this example was the best illustration of how much the Baltic countries suffered. They have now returned to the European family as democratic states. Mr. Ambartsumov from Russia regretted that Estonia did not guarantee the rights for the Russian population, and that 38 percent of its inhabitants could not participate in the elections. Mr. Kaspereit from France retorted that Estonia's Russian population was the victim of the Stalin era. However, no one could make the Governments of Estonia or Latvia change the law. The Greek communist (Korak) was the only person who attacked Estonia by saying that this country's admission to the Council of Europe would encourage its government to make even more radical moves concerning the Russian minority. He was the only speaker out of 30 who desired Estonia's nonadmission. All Council of Europe commissions recommended that Estonia be enrolled. There were two no votes and two abstentions. The rest voted for this proposal. Estonia, like Lithuania, will be officially admitted to the Council of Europe today.

Brazauskas To Visit France, Switzerland

LD0906211493 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in English 1900 GMT 9 Jun 93

[Text] Lithuanian President Algirdas Brazauskas will go on a working visit to France, scheduled for 14 and 17 June [dates as heard]. On 17 June, Mr. Brazauskas will attend the (Transmontane) forum in Switzerland. Taking part in this forum will be European heads of state and government, cabinet members, and representatives from various banks and corporations who will discuss the development of economic and political cooperation.

President Names First Ambassador to Kiev

AU1106084593 Kiev HOLOS UKRAYINY in Ukrainian 8 Jun 93 p 4

[Nadiya Doronina report: "A Lithuanian Embassy Will Soon Appear in Ukraine"]

[Text] Lithuanian President Algirdas Brazauskas is preparing a decree appointing first deputy minister of industry and trade Ramualdas Ramoshka [name as transliterated] as ambassador in Ukraine.

R. Ramoshka is 51 years old. He is a construction engineer by education. He has been deputy minister of industry and trade since the time of K. Prunskene's government.

R. Ramoshka will be the first Lithuanian ambassador in Ukraine. Since last year, Virginius Korizma [name as transliterated] has been Lithuania's temporary charge d'affaires in Ukraine.